

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

十月廿五日
 十月廿六日
 十月廿七日
 十月廿八日
 十月廿九日
 十月三十日
 十一月一日
 十一月二日
 十一月三日
 十一月四日
 十一月五日
 十一月六日
 十一月七日
 十一月八日
 十一月九日
 十一月十日
 十一月十一日
 十一月十二日
 十一月十三日
 十一月十四日
 十一月十五日
 十一月十六日
 十一月十七日
 十一月十八日
 十一月十九日
 十一月二十日
 十一月二十一日
 十一月二十二日
 十一月二十三日
 十一月二十四日
 十一月二十五日
 十一月二十六日
 十一月二十七日
 十一月二十八日
 十一月二十九日
 十一月三十日
 十二月一日
 十二月二日
 十二月三日
 十二月四日
 十二月五日
 十二月六日
 十二月七日
 十二月八日
 十二月九日
 十二月十日
 十二月十一日
 十二月十二日
 十二月十三日
 十二月十四日
 十二月十五日
 十二月十六日
 十二月十七日
 十二月十八日
 十二月十九日
 十二月二十日
 十二月二十一日
 十二月二十二日
 十二月二十三日
 十二月二十四日
 十二月二十五日
 十二月二十六日
 十二月二十七日
 十二月二十八日
 十二月二十九日
 十二月三十日

MEMOIR

ON

CHAPTER VI.

VOCABULARY OF THE ANCIENT PERSIAN LANGUAGE, CONTAINING
ALL THE WORDS WHICH OCCUR IN THE PERSIAN CUNEIFORM
INSCRIPTIONS, ACCOMPANIED WITH A FEW BRIEF ETYMOLOGICAL
EXPLANATIONS.

¶ a and á¹.

ॐ <<॥ <<॥ <॥ ॐ अक्षता, [No. 4, l. 23, p. 282,]
Extensa (?), *infracta* (?). This may be either the nom. sing.
 (fem.) of a verbal noun in ॐ, from the root अक्ष्, "to reach,"
 or "pervade," or it may be the same case of a past participle
 corresponding with the Sanskrit अक्षता, "unbroken;" (अ, neg.
 and क्षत, "broken.") It occurs but once, in the phrase *hyá*
duvaishtam shiyátish akshatá, which I translate, with some hesi-
 tation, "the longest enduring life"³.

𐌖𐌗𐌚 𐌖𐌗𐌚 𐌖𐌗𐌚 AGATA', [Col. I., l. 21, p. 199.] *Religiosus*? *Peccator*? In rendering the passage in which this word occurs, I have supposed *agata* to be employed in contradistinction to *arika*, the one signifying "a true believer," and the other "a

¹ Words in which the initial  merely represents the temporal augment will be found under the head of their respective roots.

* The figures placed in brackets after each word of the vocabulary, refer to the pages of the preceding volume in which the word first occurs.—ED.

* Lassen translates *akshatā* by "incolumis," following the same etymology which I have given; but he has certainly altogether misunderstood the general application of the sentence. See the *Zeitschrift*, &c., vol. VI., p. 69.

from decay, from (the vice of) lying!;" and we have then in continuation *ániya imám dahyám má ájamiyá*², *má hainá*, *má dushiyáram*, *má darauga*. Now as the three particular objects of evil from which danger is apprehended are thus severally repeated, it would certainly be most reasonable to suppose *ániya imám dahyám má ájamiyá* to be a distinct phrase, and to translate the entire sentence—"Let not the enemy obtain power over this country, nor servitude, nor decay, nor the vice of lying;" otherwise, if we take *ániya* for the verb, not only will the construction, which places the governing verb before the object and the nominative, be most irregular, but a fourth evil (*ájamiyá*) will be enumerated which does not occur in the preceding sentence. I find it, however, impossible to identify *ájamiyá* as a verb; if the root were *jam*, the temporal augment of the aorist would be lost after the interdictory particle; if, on the other hand, we suppose a root corresponding with the Sanskrit *जम्*, the inflexion in *amiyá* will be wholly inexplicable. I must add, also, that the final elongation (𑀓) is almost conclusive against *ájamiyá* being a verb, for that inflexion cannot, I think, in the language of the inscriptions, occur after *má*; (compare *biyá* and *má biyá*³.)

A further source of embarrassment is found in the uncertainty whether the first word of the sentence be *ániya* or *abiya*. Niebuhr and Porter have 𑀅𑀲, which Westergaard alters to 𑀅𑀬, and Lassen adopts the latter reading throughout his Memoir. If *ániya* be correct, there would seem then to be no resource but to follow the construction which I have adopted in the preceding

¹ Lassen, relying on a Zend etymology, translates *dushiyára* by "scarcity," (lit. "bad year;") I shall consider hereafter the propriety of this reading. See Lassen's Mem. above quoted.

² The words *aniya* and *ajamiyá* afford a good example of the serious inconvenience which arises from the impossibility of distinguishing the quantity of the initial 𑀓. In *ájamiyá*, the vowel must, I think, be elongated; but the context can alone show whether 𑀓 𑀅𑀬 𑀓 𑀅𑀬, may represent the Sanskrit *जम्*, or whether it may be derived from *जायते*.

³ See paragraphs 11 and 17 of the 4th column, at Behistun. The interdictory *má* requires to be joined to the aorist or imperfect without the augment, forms in which a servile long *á* can very rarely occur.

chapter, and to suppose the word, notwithstanding its displacement, to be an aorist of आसी governed by the nouns which follow it. If on the other hand the true reading should be *abiyá*¹, a preposition governing the accusative which is of the most frequent employment in the inscriptions, I would suppose the subjunctive of the substantive verb to be understood. In either case *ájamiyá* must be the nom. sing. of a feminine abstract noun, and that it is connected in signification with *hainá* may be inferred from its omission in the preceding sentence. As the latter word, therefore, may be rendered with some confidence by "servitude," I venture to translate the other "war," (literally, "war-scattering"); *dja* differing in its inflexion only from the Sanskrit आजि, and *miyá* being perhaps formed from मि, "to scatter," according to Rule 831 of Wilkins. This etymology is far from satisfactory, but I have failed to obtain any other at all suitable to the context². If it be considered necessary to bestow further enquiry on the subject, I would draw attention to the facts, that the Devanagari ह is an equally legitimate correspondent with the ह, for the Cuneiform 𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎠 ; and that a sibilant may very possibly have been elided before the 𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎠 , so that if there were any Sanskrit compound of the form of *ahasmí* or *ahasmýá*, that orthography would present the least objectionable equivalent.

𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎠 𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎠 𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎠 ATARA, [Col. I., l. 21, p. 199, and Col. II., l. 78, p. 223,] *Inter.* A preposition governing the accusative case.

¹ In the Supplement to Lassen's Memoir, which has reached me since the above was written, I perceive that he rejects Westergaard's emendation of *aniya* for *abiya*, and that the latter gentleman acquiesces in this restoration of the old reading. See the Zeitschrift, p. 470. We must therefore, I think, translate the sentence in question, "*ad hanc provinciam ne (sint), &c., &c.*"

² Lassen translates *ájamiyá* by "*hiemis tempestas*," supposing the Cuneiform term to be allied to the Sanscrit *hima*, Zend *xyáo*, (acc. *xyām*.) Latin *hiems*, &c. See the Zeitschrift, p. 33; but I must observe on the one hand, that the initial

𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎠 , which cannot be an unmeaning prosthesis, presents an insuperable etymological difficulty; while on the other, however applicable to the feelings and condition of the primitive Arian emigrants from Imaus may have been the dread of the horrors of winter depicted in the second *Fargard* of the *Vendidad*, it seems preposterous to suppose that any such apprehension could have existed amongst the inhabitants of the sunny plains of Persia.

Compare the Sanskrit अन्तर; Zend 𐎠𐎵𐎲𐎠𐎧𐎡𐎴 , *antarə*; Persian اندر, *andar*; Latin "inter," &c. It is very possible that the orthography of this word may be *atar*, the *r* being a letter which as a final is not subject to elision. I prefer, however, following the Zend termination, and supposing the suffix of comparison, which forms the second element of the term, to be *tara* rather than *tar*, in the language of the inscriptions.

𐎠𐎵𐎲𐎠𐎧𐎡𐎴 ATIYÁISHA, [Col. III., l. 72, p. 237,] *Transivit.* 3rd pers. sing. act. imperfect of a verb compounded of the particle of excess, (Sanskrit अति), and of a root *aish*, answering to the Sanskrit इष् , इष् , and इष् , appear to be cognate roots¹, but that the latter is the true correspondent of the Cuneiform *aish* may be inferred from our observing that the verb in the inscriptions follows the first instead of the fourth conjugation, as well as from the orthography of the compound *atiyáisha*, where the medial 𐎠𐎵 must represent a radical letter, rather than the mere augment of past time. *Ati*+*aisha* (the latter being the imperfect of *ish*), would I believe be written *ati-yaisha*, without the employment of any character to express the temporal augment. To account for the elongation of the *a*, we must suppose a root *aish*, forming in the imperfect *áisha*; the terminal 𐎠𐎵 of the Sanskrit imperfect is as usual elided in the Cuneiform correspondent; इष् in Sanskrit signifies "to go," or "approach;" *aish* in the inscriptions is used exclusively in the sense of "coming;" with the particle *fra*, (Sans. प्र), and in the causal form it denotes "sending," while the present compound can only be translated, "he went beyond," or "he went in." In the Notes on the Cuneiform Text, and in the explanation which I have given of the 11th paragraph of the 3rd column at Behistun, I have noticed certain difficulties connected with the orthography of this word², as well as with the construction of the

¹ For a full examination of the Cuneiform roots *ish* and *aish*, see under the head *ish*.

² My rough copy gives the reading of *Atiyádasha*, but as the letters were much defaced, I must I think have mistaken 𐎠𐎵 for 𐎠𐎵 .

sentence in which it occurs; and I consider it therefore, at present, to be unnecessary to bestow any further inquiry on the subject.

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡𐽢𐽣𐽤𐽥𐽦𐽧𐽨𐽩𐽪𐽫𐽬𐽭𐽮𐽯𐽰𐽱𐽲𐽳𐽴𐽵𐽶𐽷𐽸𐽹𐽺𐽻𐽼𐽽𐽾𐽿𐾀𐾁𐾃𐾅𐾂𐾄𐾆𐾇𐾈𐾉𐾊𐾋𐾌𐾍𐾎

kins, and the inflexion in *iya* corresponding regularly to the Sanskrit locative in ई, इ); but with the adjunct of the imperative *par(a)śā*, I translate the phrase idiomatically, "utterly destroy," or "or cast out into utter perdition." For further observations on the word, see the notes to the fourteenth paragraph of the fourth column at Behistun, (p. 253). The Median correspondent of the term is unfortunately mutilated, and affords little or no assistance therefore in identifying its grammatical condition.

ÁTHAG-AINA, [No. 10, l. 1, p. 314,] *Ædificatore* or *Ædificatiōne*.

ÁTHAG-ANÁM, [No. 19, lines 29, 30, p. 342,] *Edificium.*

I have examined these obscure words at considerable length in the notes which I have added to Nos. 10 and 19, but I have failed to identify them at all to my satisfaction¹. That a root *thag* may have existed in the language of the inscriptions, intermediate between the Sanskrit **तग्**, (perhaps originally **शग्**), and the Greek **τέγω**, Latin “*tégo*,” may be reasonably admitted, and that the application of such a root may have been extended from “covering,” to “building,” is also sufficiently approved by Greek and Latin analogies; but there still remains the difficulty of ascertaining the power and grammatical condition of the derivatives. I had supposed the termination in *áthagina* to be the ablative inflexion of a noun formed with the suffix of agency, (Sans. **इन्**)², while in *áthaganam* I have conjectured that we have the accusative of a noun of attribution, formed with **अन** or **अना**³, but the alteration of the orthography from *áthagina* to *áthagaina*, which

¹ Professor Lassen continues up to the present time to compare the Cuneiform *thag* with the Persian طاق, (see *Zeitschrift*, pp. 75 and 472), but the latter word is a pure Arabic derivative, (طاق, "an arch," from طوق, "to be equal,") and could not have been known in Persia prior to the Mohammedan conquest. I hardly see moreover how he obtains from this source the meaning of "substructure."

² See Wilkin's Grammar, Rules 106 and 769. The suffix in *in* is very commonly employed in Zend, and is preserved also in the modern Persian. Compare شیرین, "sweet;" زرین, "golden;" سنگین, "heavy;" رنگین, "coloured," &c.

⁸ See Wilkins, Rules 824 and 833.

follows from my discovery of the exclusive employment of  with the vowel *a*, is fatal to the former explanation. If *athagaina* could be considered a nominative, there would certainly be less difficulty in translating the window-inscription of the palace of Darius; but this identification, again, appears impossible, for the suffix in  forms that case in , and the termination also of the Median correspondent is, I think, that which belongs to the genitive or instrumental, and not to the nominative¹. In translating, therefore, *Ardastána áthagaina Dárayava(h)ush naqahyá vithiyá karta*, while I doubtfully adhere to the reading before given of "Executed by *Ardastá the architect*, for the family of King Darius," I suppose the ending in *aina* to be the regular instrumental characteristic of a theme in *a*, (Sans. ). In the other phrase *imam 'ustashanám áthaganám nám upa nám kartá*, "I have executed this well fashioned piece of masonry for my own use," I am not prepared at present to propose any alteration; the conjunction of a masc. pronoun *imam* with a noun formed by the feminine suffix in *aná*, is, I think, a barbarism

¹ Where the Median reproduces a Persian word, of course the termination in *na* may occur in the nom., but I doubt exceedingly if the Median *asanna* be a reproduction of the Persian *áthagaina*, for the initial letter is that which uniformly answers to   and not to  alone.

² I must observe, however, that the termination in *aina* is otherwise entirely unknown in the inscriptions, and that as it is evidently a secondary and artificial form for the instrumental, it is highly improbable that it should have co-existed with the primitive ending in long *a*, which occurs in every other Cuneiform example on record; *aina*, in fact, contains three distinct etymological irregularities; the *a* of the base is changed to *ai* () a euphonic *n* is then added, and the true instrumental case-suffix  is shortened to . See Bopp's Comp. Gram., s. 168. At the same time, I cannot identify *aina* as the nom. of a suffix either of agency or attribution, and I am obliged therefore to remain content with its possible correspondence with the Sans. . I must add, also, as a further correction of the translation given in the text, that even admitting *athagaina* to be an instrumental, *Ardastána* cannot possibly represent that case. *Ardastána* for *Ardastánas* may be gen. or an ablat., but neither am I satisfied that those cases are ever used for the instrum., nor do I think that a gen. or abl. noun could possibly be joined to an instrument. adjective. If, therefore, *áthagaina* be really the instrumental of the noun *áthaga*, perhaps the best translation may be "made by the labour of *Ardastá*, for the family of King Darius." For further remarks see the note to *Ardastána*.

which could only appear in the degraded inscriptions of Artaxerxes Ochus; but it is equally possible that the noun may be really in the masc. gender, the true suffix of attribution being **अन**, and the second *a* in *anám* being irregularly lengthened. I must add, that, unwilling as I always am to admit of an unmeaning prosthesis, I conjecture the initial **𐎠** to be the particle **आइ**, prefixed to the root for the express purpose of altering the signification from "covering" to "building."

𐎠 𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠 ATHIYA, [Col. I., l. 91, p. 213,] *Juxta* or *Ex-adversus*. I am not quite certain of the orthography of this word, but I believe the form of *athiya* to be correct. It is a preposition governing the accusative case, and probably corresponds with the Sanskrit **अनि**, the Devanagari nasal lapsing as usual before a dental, and the *t* being perhaps subjected to aspiration in order to mark a distinction between this term and the particle **अनि**, which is found in *atidyásha* and *atifrashtádiya*. Whether at the same time the signification be that of "near," which appertains to the Sanskrit **अनि**, or whether the Cuneiform particle may not rather be compared in its application, as in its form, with the Greek **ἀντί**, "over against," I cannot pretend to say; for *athiya* occurs but in a single passage of the inscriptions, and there is no correspondent either in Zend or Persian.

𐎠 𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠

ATHUR-Á, [Col. I., l. 14, 15, p. 197, &c.¹] *Assyria*.

ATHUR-ÁYÁ, [Col. II., l. 53, p. 221,] *Assyriá*.

Under this form we have the true primitive orthography of Assyria. The Greeks, as it is well known, usually write the name 'Ασσυρία, but in Strabo, Arrian, and Stephen² we find 'Αρσυρία, and in Dio Cassius 'Αρσυρία, the latter author particularly adding that the

¹ It would be tedious and unprofitable to enumerate all the passages in which each particular word occurs. The reference is usually to the first passage in which the word is found, following the order of the inscriptions as they are given in the preceding chapters.

² See Strabo XVI., s. 52; Arrianus Alexander, l. III., c. 7; and Stephen, in voce *Nívos*, where however he merely quotes from Strabo. Suidas repeats the quotation under the same head.

barbarians changed the *sigma* to a *tau*¹. Among the races who dwell upon the Upper Tigris, there seems indeed to have always been some uncertainty as to the pronunciation of the name. The Persian *Athurá* is rendered in the Median *Assura*²; and the Chaldee Targums, both of Onkelos and Jonathan, give the form of אֲתוּרָא for the Hebrew אֲשׁוּרָא³. In Arabic, the orthography of *أثور* has been always followed, and the title is still known in the country as a name for the ruins of that ancient and magnificent capital, which is being at present excavated under British auspices⁴. It is very remarkable, that in the Samaritan Pentateuch the name of *Assur* or *Athur* should be altered to *Astun*, a degradation of phonetic powers precisely analogous to that which in Pehlevi has converted *Mithra* or *Mihir* to *Matún*, and which I believe enters largely into the organization of the language of the Median Inscriptions⁵. The *Athurá* of Behistun and Persepolis is undoubtedly the province of Assyria. The name is inflected as a feminine noun of the first declension, and the termination in *áyá* may be certainly considered as an abbreviation of *áyás*, the terminal *visarga*, as I have before observed, lapsing in the ancient Persian after *a*; *𐎠𐎡𐎴*, however, in Sans. is the sign of the genitive or ablative of themes in long *á*, while, on the contrary, we may determine *Athuráyá* to be unquestionably a locative (geographical names in the language of the inscriptions being always placed in that case, although with a

¹ Dio Cass. I. LV., s. 28.

² The name of Assyria I also believe to be extant in the Babylonian Inscription on the grave of Darius, but I cannot yet satisfy myself of its exact orthography.

³ See Reimar's note to Dio Cass., tom. II., p. 1141, and Walton's Polyglot Bible, p. 39.

⁴ The Arabic Geographers always give the title of *Athúr* to the great ruined capital near the mouth of the Upper Zab. The ruins are now usually known by the name of Nimrud. It would seem highly probable that they represent the site of the Calah of Genesis, for the Samaritan Pentateuch names this city *Lachisa*, which is evidently the same title as the *Λάρισα* of Xenophon, the Persian *r* being very usually replaced both in Median and Babylonian by a guttural. (Compare the *Chabassoarach* of Berosus with the *Laborosoarchod* of Josephus.) If Nimrud be Calah, the name of *Καλαχηνή* attaching to the province will be sufficiently explained, but Resen, named by the Samaritans *Aspa*, will still have to be discovered.

⁵ Upon this connexion depend very important ethnographical considerations which I shall expose in the sequel.

genitive signification), and it is satisfactory therefore to find that in the Vedas such an inflexion does actually occur with a locative meaning and, as I believe, representing the true locative case¹. The Cuneiform locatives, indeed, strongly support the inference, which is also deducible from the Zend, that the terminal *m*, employed in the inflexion of this case in many of the Sanskrit declensions, is a degradation of a primitive *s*; **आस्यं** could not become *áyá*, nor could *iyá* and *uvá* be modified from **यं** and **वं**. The locative feminine inflexions, which in the language of the inscriptions are *áyá*, *iyá*, and *uvá*, unquestionably represent Sanskrit terminations in *áyás*, *yás*, and *vás*, and we may confidently assume therefore that the final *m* which is now used is comparatively a modern corruption.

ÁDI-NÁ, [Col. I., lines 44, 46, p. 203, &c.,] *Abstulit.*

ÁDI-NAM, [Col. I., l. 59, p. 204, &c.,] *Abstuli.*

The signification of these terms is sufficiently verified by the context of the various passages in which they occur, but the etymology is far from certain; *adi* evidently implies in the inscriptions "to, dispossess," or "take away from," and I conjecture therefore that it answers to the Sanskrit *धि*, preceded by the privative *अ*. If this be admitted, we must suppose *adinam* and *adina* to represent the 1st and 3rd persons of the active imperfect, the initial *म* being elongated by the *sandhi* of the temporal augment with the privative particle, and the suffix in *ना* being the characteristic of the ninth conjugation². At the same time, it remains entirely obscure

¹ See Bopp's Comparative Grammar, (Eng. edit.) s. 198 and 202, with the note to p. 215. It appears, however, that Panini (VII. 1. 39) considers the Vedic दक्षिणायाम्, "in dexterâ," to be a genitive used for a locative, and certainly this transposition is very frequent in Zend. I prefer at the same time adopting Bopp's explanation, that the termination in *ām* is a corruption of *ās*.

* **अ** in Sanskrit, however, is of the sixth conjugation, and with the prefixing of the particle of negation it would signify "not to possess," rather than "to dispossess." These are strong arguments against its identity with the Cuneiform **𐎠𐎶**, yet I find no other possible correspondent

to me why the quantity of the vowel, preserved in the inflexion of the 3rd person, (*ná* for नार्), should be suppressed in that of the first (*nam* for नां); and this difficulty is of equal prominence, whether we follow the etymology given above, or whether we vary the conjugation from the ninth class to the first, and, founding upon the Latin *ten-eo*, suppose the root to be *din* rather than *di*¹. There are two other forms in the inscriptions, *ditam* and *didiya*, which appear to be derived from the same root in its crude state, (that is, without the prefixing of the privative particle); but these forms afford no assistance in determining whether the Sanskrit base end in *i* or *n*, for the nasal lapses in the inscriptions before a dental, and *ditam* and *didiya* may possibly therefore be for *dintam* and *dindiya*.

I will only add that, as the Cuneiform $\Xi\Upsilon$ replaces an aspirate and a lingual as well as a dental, a correspondent may be sought in other languages of the form of *hin* or *lin*, as well as that of *din* or *tin*, and that if any such root should exist with the sense of "deprivation," we must alter the quantity of the initial vowel in *adiná*, and suppose the Υ to represent the mere temporal augment. The verb in the inscriptions uniformly governs a double accusative; as in *Gaumáta hya Magush ádiná Kabujiyam utá Pársam utá Mádam*, "Gomates the Magian dispossessed Cambyses both of Persia and Media;" *Adam khshatrámshim ádinam*, "I dispossessed him of the empire," &c.

Υ Υ Υ Υ Υ

ATRIN-A, [Col. I., l. 74, p. 209,] proper name, *Atrines*.

ATRIN-AM, [Col. I., line 76, p. 209,] *Atrinem*.

The name of Atrina, which is borne in the inscriptions by the chief who excited a revolt in Susiana immediately after the accession of Darius, is not to be found I believe in Grecian history. It

¹ That is, *din* in the first conjugation should make the 1st pers. sing. of the imperf. in *ádinam* and the 3rd pers. in *áдина* (for *ádinat*), with the short instead of the long *a*. Examples, moreover, of the above regular formation of the verbs of the first class are so common in the inscriptions, that the final Υ in *ádiná*, may be held determinately to remove the root from that conjugation.

² I do not at present remember any form with this sense in the cognate languages which will admit of a possible comparison, but the Scottish *aint*, "lost."

is doubtless of Arian etymology, and is in all probability of cognate derivation with the Sanskrit अश्वि¹. In representing this name, the Median and Babylonian alphabets, incapable of expressing the compound *tš* of the Persian language, alter the power to a sibilant, and write *Assina* or *Ashina*.

< > ATRIYÁTIYA-HYA [Col. I., l. 89,
p. 211, &c.,] *Atriatís*. This was the name of a month in the
ancient Persian Calendar, and may certainly be compared with the
Sanskrit अत्रिजात, the Cuneiform < > being, as I think, a regular
correspondent for the Devanagari ज. The suffix in the Sanskrit
name is जात. In the Cuneiform correspondent it may be जात,
with the i interposed to break up the groupe ty, but I doubt
whether this identity of form may authorize us in supposing the
early Persians to have adopted the fable regarding the double
birth of the Moon from the eye of Atri and from the Ocean, from
which etymologists derive the Sanskrit compound. Possibly the
name of *Atriyáta* was applied to the moon by the Arian race
previous to the bifurcation of the Indian and Persian branches,
and was subsequently adopted by the latter into their calendar
without any reference to the original meaning. I have before
observed, that in the Cuneiform orthography of the word the
 and are employed indifferently, but I am now inclined
to think I must have been mistaken in the former reading*; the
Median form is *Assiyátíya*. The names of the months occur in
the inscriptions only in the genitive case, and it is remark-
able that those names which are of the first declension give the

¹ अत्रि is supposed by the grammarians to be derived from अद्, "to eat," but no great dependence can be placed on the explanations of these fanciful etymologists.

* It was the apparent interchangeability of the letters $\Xi\Upsilon\Upsilon$ and $\Xi\Upsilon\Upsilon$ in the orthography of the terms *pridiya* and *Aṭṛiyāṭiya*, that induced me, against all etymological evidence, to class the former character among the surd dentals; but I have corrected this error in my Supplementary Note on the Alphabet, p. 179. In the 38th line of the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, I also think in the word *yadipatiya*, the doubtful character which I have restored as $\Xi\Upsilon\Upsilon$ must be altered to $\Xi\Upsilon\Upsilon$. See p. 301.

the pronominal suffix of the 2nd pers. The Median correspondent for *ada* in Westergaard's Inscription of Nakhsh-i-Rustam is read in two different ways. In line 35, the form (although with a slight difference of orthography) is the same in pronunciation as that which answers in other passages to the demonstrative *ava*, and its signification of "that," is thus placed almost beyond the reach of dispute; but in line 36, either Westergaard's copy is incorrect, or the inflexion of the pronoun has been altered. I cannot explain with any certainty the reason why the neuter characteristic should be dropped in *adataiya*, but I observe the same peculiarity in the declension of the demonstrative *ava*, which as the neuter accusative, is *avashchiya* with the indefinite particle, but *avataiya* with the pronominal suffix¹; and I infer therefore that the neuter termination in *as* being regularly in the inscriptions contracted to *a*, whether it occur singly or in composition, is alone restored to its original form (strengthened by an aspiration) when it precedes a suffix commencing with the palatal *ch*, which letter, both in Zend and in the ancient Persian, has the prosodial power of the enclitical particles.

𐎠𐎡𐎴𐎠𐎡𐎴 ADAM, [passim.] *Ego*. The pronoun of the 1st person has been so frequently examined and so extensively compared by philologists, that in explaining the Cuneiform inflexions I need do little more than present their Sanskrit and Zend correspondents. In the inscriptions we have the following forms:—

SINGULAR.

Nom.	<i>Adam</i>	(Sans. अहं)	Zend 𐬀𐬵𐬌𐬎, <i>azēm</i> .)
Accus.	<i>Mām</i>	(Sans. मां)	Zend 𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, <i>mām</i> .)
Ablat.	<i>-ama</i>	(used as an affix).	
Gen. used also for Instrum. and Dative	<i>Maná</i>	(Sans. मन)	Zend 𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, <i>mana</i> .
			Pers. (من)

PLURAL.

Nom.	<i>Vayam</i>	(Sans. वयं)	Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬌𐬎, <i>vaēm</i> .)
Gen.	<i>Amákham</i>	(Sans. अस्मान्)	Zend 𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, <i>ahmákēm</i> . Pali <i>amhákam</i> .)

¹ From observing many other examples, I can now affirm that it is a fixed rule of the old Persian language, that the pronominal neuter characteristic, whether it be *s* or *t*, should be every where elided except before the indefinite particle *chiya*.

² In examining the Babylonian writing, I have become aware of a connection

The singular suffix in *maiya*, answering to the Sans. मे *mé* (for *mai*), and Zend 𐬨𐬀 *mé*, is also of a very frequent employment, and represents indifferently the possessive pronoun "meus," without reference to case, or the instrumental, dative, or genitive of the personal pronoun. The plural suffix has not yet, I believe, been discovered.

I will now add a few remarks on the different forms. *Adam* occurs either singly, or in composition with the suffixes of the 3rd person, *adamshiya*, *adamshim*, and *adamshám*, signifying respectively, "ego illius," "ego illum" (or "illos,") and "ego illorum."

In the classical inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes *mám* is exclusively used as the accusative, but in the degraded language of Artaxerxes Ochus it appears, contrary to all rule, to usurp the place of the nominative, and in that capacity to govern a verbal noun. Compare *mám upá mám kartá*, "ego in meum usum factor," and *tya mám kartá*, "quod ego factor."

The ablative *ama* (for *mat*) is only met with in composition after a preposition governing that case, as in *hacháma*, "a me," and perhaps in *pruvama*, "ante me," although this last identification is doubtful¹.

between the forms of the pronoun of the 1st pers. in the Arian and Semitic languages, to which I must devote a brief explanation. In the Arian languages we may take the Sans. *ah* as the true base, which has become *as* in Zend; *ad* in old Persian; *éy* in Greek; *eg* in Latin; *ik* in Goth; *ih* in old Ger.; *as* in Lithuanian; *as* in old Slavonic, &c. To this base has been added in many of these languages a suffix, for the purpose, as it would seem, of specification, and we have thus *ah-am*; *as-əm*; *ad-am*, *éy-ów*, whence *éy-ó*, and *ego*. Now, the same base has been employed in the Semitic languages, but instead of the suffix in *am* being appended, it has been prefixed to the pronoun under the form of *an*, (which seems to mark it as a definite article,) and in most of the later languages this article has remained as the dominant element, while the true base has been almost lost. Thus in Babylonian, preceded by the distinctive sign, we have *ak* or *aka* for *ego*, but without the sign, *anak* or *anaka*; and in the same way we have the compound forms 𐤀𐤍𐤍 in Heb.; 𐤀𐤎𐤓𐤕 in Coptic; and 𐤀𐤓𐤓𐤓 in Æolic Gr.: whilst in the

Heb. 𐤀𐤍𐤍; the Chald. 𐤀𐤎𐤍𐤍; the Syr. ܐܢܝ; the Arab. ٱنّ; and Æth. 𐩦𐩣: the true base has been almost absorbed in the article. The same analysis must be applied to the 1st pers. plur. as well as to the pron. of the 2nd pers. Compare Bopp's Comp. Gr. s. 326; Pritchard on the Celt. Lang. p. 110; Gesen. Lex., Eng. Ed. p. 79; and Conant's Translation of the *Lehrgebäude*, p. 38, foot note.

¹ That this affix is *ama* rather than *ma* is proved, I think, not only by the orthography of *paruvama*, but by that also of *anuvama*, which would otherwise be written *paruma* and *anuma*, and we have here therefore the same base with a euphonic prothesis which occurs in the Gr. ἐμὲ, ἐμοῦ, ἐμέθεν, &c., and in the

The genitive *mand*, which only differs from the Sanskrit मन् in the modification of the nasal and the dialectic elongation of the terminal *a*, is the form which has been most usually adopted as a base, not only in the languages of the Arian family, but in those also of the various branches of the great Scythic race. I do not exactly understand upon what inflexional principle this genitive is formed either in Sanskrit or old Persian, but there can be no doubt, I presume, of the identity of the terminations in *ma* and *na*. When the Cuneiform term is united to a suffixed particle, the final elongation is suppressed, as in *manachá*, "meique," (Ins. No. 3, lines 9, 10,) and its true orthography therefore is precisely similar to that of the Zend مانا, *mana*.

The plur. nom. *vayam*, common to the Sanskrit, the Zend, and the old Persian, is derived from a base, *vé*, which may possibly be a mere corrupted inflexion of the singular *ma*, but which, as it is also found in the Goth. "*veis*;" old Germ. "*wir*;" Eng. "*we*," &c., must under its own form be of great antiquity¹. Another plur. base also, *asme*, which occurs in the Vedas, and which answers to

Pers. affixed *am*. It is doubtful, however, if in *anuvama* the affixed *ama* does not represent the locative rather than the ablat. case, for in the phrase *anuva 'Ufrá-tauvá*, the former appears to be the case employed.

¹ For observations on this gen. form, see Bopp's Comp. Gr. s. 330, and consult the extensive list of cognate Scythic forms given by Pritchard in his *Researches into the Physical Hist. of Man*, vol. IV., p. 390, and by Klaproth, in his *Sprach-atlas*, pp. 16, and 30, 31.

² If *vayam* stand for *vé + am*, as philologists are now agreed, it follows that the Zend *vaém* should be equal to *vai + ém*. According to Burnouf, however, مانا can only be explained as a contraction of *aya*, and the Zend therefore is not a primitive but a secondary form, less ancient than its Cuneiform correspondent. (See Yaçna, sur l'Alph. Zend, p. 55.) The termination in *é* being the regular pronominal plural characteristic, *vé* must be referred to a sing. *va*, and that this *va* again is in its origin identical with *ma*, the base of the oblique case in the singular, is rendered extremely probable by the analogy not only of the Scythic, but of the Semitic plurals. Thus in all the Turkish dialects the plur. is formed by a suffix of number, from the singular. Conf. Mong. *bi*, I, and *bi-da*, we; Mandshu, *bi* and *be*; Turk. *ben* and *biz*, and particularly Finnish *ma* and *me*; and in the Semitic languages it must be observed, that the terminal *na* or *nu*, which distinguishes the 1st person plur. is also in reality a suffix of plurality, evidently allied to the plural-ending in verbs and in masculine nouns, in all of which a nasal is the chief element. Thus מְנַחֵם is the plur. of מְנַחֵם, and retrenching the prefixed article and the plur. sign מְנַחֵם, we find the singular base מְ exchanged for מְ. In the same way the ח in מְנַחֵם, the Arab. correspondent of מְנַחֵם, is the

the Gr. *ἀμμες* (for *ἀρμες*), has produced the gen. *amákham*, a form of which I have already given the correspondents in Sanskrit, Zend, and Pali, and which is properly a possessive rather than a personal pronoun¹.

𑀅𑀲𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓

ÁNAYA, [Col. II., l. 88, p. 226,] *Adduxit*.

ÁNAYAM (?) [Col. I., l. 87, p. 211,] *Adduxi*.

ÁNAYATÁ, [Col. I., l. 82, p. 210; and Col. II., l. 73, p. 223,] *Adducebatur*.

ANIYA (?) [Col. V., l. 12, p. 258,] *Adductus est*.

These forms are derived from the root यी with the prefixed particle आङ. *A'naya* answers to either आनयत् or आनयन्, the 3rd pers. sing. or plural of the active imperfect, and *ánayam* (if that term is really found in the inscriptions) will be the 1st pers. sing. of the same tense. *A'nayatá* expresses regularly the Sanskrit आनयत्, and should represent therefore the 3rd pers. sing. of the middle imperf. In both the passages, however, where the word occurs, there is some difficulty regarding it. In the one it is, I believe, united to the past participle *basta*, and in the other it is impossible to ascertain from the broken fragments now alone visible upon the rock, whether the true orthography be *ánayatá* or *aniyatá*. The context, at the same time, clearly shows that it is used with a passive signification; and perhaps, therefore, in the compound *bastánayatá*, "vinctus adducebatur," the middle voice may have that power²,

true pronominal base which has been lost in the sing. 𑀅𑀲𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓. It is remarkable, however, that in almost all the Arian tongues, in the plural of the 1st pers. the pronominal base has given way altogether to the suffix of number; for we can hardly doubt that the nasal in 𑀅𑀲𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓, Lat. *nos*; Russ. *nas*; Welsh *ni*, &c. is to be thus explained. The Median plurals are of great importance in illustrating this question, and will be considered hereafter.

¹ For Bopp's remarks on *asmé* and *asmákam*, see Comp. Gr. s. 332, and the "Remark" added to section 340. He clearly shows that the termination of *asmákam* is a possessive suffix allied to the Hindustani *ká, ké, ki*. In the Cuneiform *amakhham*, the lapse of the sibilant before the nasal is regular, but I am quite unable to explain the reason of the aspiration of the guttural.

² I shall have repeated occasion hereafter to notice the employment of the middle for the passive voice, as in *agaubatá*, "he was called;" *agarbáyatá*, "he was seized," &c.

while in the 13th paragraph of the second col. at Behistun, the term employed may be *aniyatá* answering to the Sans. pass. imperf. **अनीयत**.

I observe, that in the 13th and 14th paragraphs of the second col. at Behistun, the Median correspondents for *ánaya* and *ánayatá* (or *ániyatá*), are those which usually express the idea of "sending;" but I cannot reconcile such an interpretation with Sanskrit etymology, and conjecture accordingly the substitution of "sending" for "bringing," to be an instance of careless translation.

In my previous notes on the fifth col. at Behistun, and on Ins. No. 3, p. 276, I have supposed that *ániya* may be a form of the aorist, substituted for the Sanskrit **अनीयीत्** or **अनेइ**; but this is, to say the least of it, extremely doubtful; for in the latter passage the true orthography may very possibly be *abiya*¹, and in the former, owing to the mutilation of the writing, we cannot determine whether *ániya* be really a verbal formation, or whether it may not rather represent the pronoun **अन्य**, which repeatedly occurs in the inscriptions in other places, inflected nearly in the same manner as in Sanskrit. If *ániya*, in line 12 of the fifth col. at Behistun, signify "other" or "an enemy," the quantity of the initial letter will be short.

𐎠𐎡𐎢 **𐎠𐎡𐎢** ANÁ. See IYAM.

𐎠𐎡𐎢 **𐎠𐎡𐎢** **𐎠𐎡𐎢** **𐎠𐎡𐎢** ANÁMAKA-HYA, [Col. I., l. 96, p. 213, &c.,] *Anamacis*. In this title, which is applied to one of the months of the old Persian Calendar, we have probably the "unnamed," (**अनामक**), or intercalary month of India. In the Persian year it followed soon after *Garmapada*, and I conjecture it therefore to have occurred at the autumnal equinox. The termination in *hya* is the regular genitive inflexion of the first declension (Sans. **स्य**).

¹ See the notes to *ájamiyá*, where I have shown that the reading of *ániya* for *abiya* adopted by Lassen, on the authority of Westergaard, has been since retracted. I believe, therefore, that *ániya*, as a derivative from the root **अनी**, must be rejected from the Vocabulary.

𑀩𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓𑀢𑀺 ANIYA. This is the exact equivalent of the Sans.

अन्यः, and the Latin "alius;" the *l* and *n* being to a certain extent interchangeable letters¹. That *aniya* in the inscriptions follows the pronominal declension, as in Sanskrit, is shown by the ablative form *aniyaná* for *anyasmát*, instead of *aniyá* for *anyát*; as well as by the nominative neuter, which gives the orthography of *aniyash*, (with the developement and aspiration of the visarga peculiar to pronouns), before the enclitical particle *chiya*. We have the following cases of the pronoun in different passages of the inscriptions.

SINGULAR.

Nom. masc. *Aniya*, (Col. I., l. 95, p. 213, and Col. III., l. 32, p. 232.) Sans. अन्यः

Nom. neut. *Aniyash-chiya*, (Col. IV., l. 46, p. 247, and No. 15, l. 13, p. 329.)

Accus. masc. *Aniyam*, (Col. l. 86, p. 211.) Sans. अन्यं

Ablat. masc. *Aniyaná*, (No. 4, lines 20, 21, p. 282.) Sans.

अन्यस्मात्

Gen. masc. *Aniyahyá*, (Col. I., l. 87, p. 211.) Sans. अन्यस्य

PLURAL.

Nom. masc. *Aniyá*, (Col. IV., lines 61 and 62, p. 252.) Sans. अन्ये

Nom. fem. *Aniyá*, (Col. I., l. 41, p. 201.) Sans. अन्याः

Accus. fem. *Aniyá*, (Col. I., l. 47, p. 203, and l. 67, p. 205.)

Sans. अन्याः

Locat. fem. *Aniyá'uvá*, (Col. I., l. 35, p. 200.) Sans. अन्यासु

¹ According to Bopp, the Sans. अन्य is formed of the base अन् and the relative य, and this appears to be fully borne out by his analysis and examples. See Comp. Gr. s. 374, where the following terms are compared: Sans. अन्य; Latin *alius*; Prakrit *anna*; Goth. *alya*; Gr. ἄλλος; old Germ. *alles*, &c. In the Cuneiform *aniya* the *i* is undoubtedly euphonic, being introduced to combine the *n* and *y*, which will not unite in a compound articulation. The base *ana* is also extensively employed in Zend.

The inflexions in *aniyash-chiya*, in *aniyaná*, and in *aniyáuvá*, are all of orthographical value; the Sanskrit form answering to *aniyash* must have been *अन्यः*, instead of *अन्यत्*¹, and the *vi-sarga* elided as a terminal (as in the nom. masc.) can only have been aspirated after the short *a* by the enclitical power of the indefinite particle, a power which is analogous in principle, though not exactly assimilating in operation, to that possessed by the Zend *𐬀𐬎𐬎*, of preserving intact, both in form and quantity, the inflexion to which it is appended².

In *aniyaná*, independently of the suppression of the silent terminal, we have a modification of the nasal from *m* to *n*, and the elision of the preceding sibilant³. In *aniyáuvá*, also, we have, 1st, the substitution after the *a* of the base, (which is elongated as a mark of gender) of an aspiration inherent in the Cuneiform *𐬀𐬎𐬎*, for the sibilant of the Sanskrit locative affix; 2nd, the introduction of an euphonic *v* to connect the *u* with the dissimilar vowel *a*; and 3rd, the dialectic elongation of the latter vowel as a terminal, an elongation which also occurs in the genitive *aniyahydá*⁴.

¹ I have before observed, that where a terminal *s* does occur in a Sanskrit neuter, as in *अन्यत्*, it is considered by Bopp to be the weakened form of a primitive *t*, (see Comp. Gr. s. 350,) but perhaps the Cuneiform examples of *aniyash* and *avash* may change the Professor's opinion.

² For a full explanation of the enclitical power of the Zend *𐬀𐬎𐬎*, see Yaçna, p. 27, and Bopp's Comparative Grammar, (Eng. Edit.) p. 163. Rosen also has a note on the enclitical power of the Vedic *chana*, in his explanation of l. 7, Hymn xviii. of the Rig Veda. See his "Adnotationes," p. xlv.

³ If Bopp's theory be true of the common derivation of the Sanskrit pronominal inflexions from the particle *sma* appended to the base, we should expect to find the same orthography in the ablat. *aniyaná*, and in the genitive *amákham*, the one being for *anya-smát*, and the other for *a-smákam*; I cannot pretend to dispute his theory, (Comp. Gr. s. 166 and 183,) supported as it is by Zend and Pali analogy, yet the uniform employment of the suffix in *ná* for the old Persian pronominal sing. ablat. (compare *aniyaná* with *aná* and *tyaná*,) certainly indicates a distinction from the particle *ma* (for *sma*,) which occurs in the plur. of the 1st person.

⁴ On further consideration, I prefer comparing the Cuneiform inflexion in *úvâ* (for *huvâ*) with the primitive Sans. *हव*, which in Zend has become *𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀*,

the Median writing the term is usually considered unworthy of translation, and that where it is rendered the equivalent is evidently an unimportant particle, I prefer comparing it with the Sanskrit **अपि**, and considering it a mere copulative conjunction. A further argument in support of this explanation is, that at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, *apiya* is attached to the preceding word, (the orthography being given of *duriápiya* for *duria* + *apiya*), precisely in the same manner as we find the particles *chā* and *vā* to be employed in other passages as copulative suffixes.

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡𐽢𐽣𐽤𐽥𐽦𐽧𐽨𐽩𐽪𐽫𐽬𐽭𐽮

INDICATIVE PRESENT.

- 1st Pers. Sing. *Amiya*, (passim). Sans. अस्मि. Zend 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 , *ahmi*.
- 2nd do. do. *Ahya*, (Col. IV., l. 37, p. 245, &c.) Sans. असि. Zend 𐬀𐬢𐬵 , *ahi*¹?
- 3rd do. do. *Astiya*, (Col. IV., l. 46, p. 247, l. 51, p. 249.) Sans. अस्ति. Zend 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵 , *asti*.
- 3rd Pers. Plur. *Hatiya*, (Col. IV., lines 61 and 63, p. 252.) Sans. सन्ति. Zend. 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵 , *heñti*.

IMPERFECT ACTIVE.

- 1st Pers. Sing. *A'ham*, (Col. I., l. 14, p. 197, &c.) Sans. आसं.
- 3rd do. do. *A'ha*, (passim.) Vedic असन्. Zend 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵 , *doḡhat*.
- 3rd Pers. Plur. *A'ha*, (Col. I., l. 10, p. 197, &c.) Sans. आसन्. Zend 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬢𐬵 , *doḡhēn*.

IMPERFECT MIDDLE.

- 1st Pers. Plur. *A'mahya*, (Col. I., lines 7, 8, and 11, p. 196, 197.)
- 3rd do. do. *A'hata* or *A'hatá*, (Col. III., l. 49, p. 233, and Col. I., l. 19, p. 197.)

PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE.

- 3rd Pers. Sing. *Ahatiya*, (Col. IV., l. 38, p. 245, l. 68, p. 253.)

In the forms of the indicative present, we have the lapse of the sibilant before *m* in *amiya*², and the lapse of the nasal before *t* in *hatiya*. *Ahya* and *astiya* reproduce the Sanskrit forms as nearly as the Cuneiform orthography will admit.

¹ I do not remember to have met with the 2nd pers. sing. pres. of the substantive verb in Zend, but I presume that the form must be *ahi*, agreeably to the orthographical rules of the language.

² M. Burnouf has an excellent note on the suppression in Zend of *s* in the initial group *sm*, (Yagna, Notes, &c., p. lxxvii. Note O,) and he explains the substitution of *mahi* for *masi*, in the 1st pers. plur. of the ind. pres. by supposing the personal characteristic to be detached from the root; but this restriction will certainly not apply to the substant. verb in the language of the inscriptions, for the *s* which is lost in *amiya* and *amahya* is radical, and has no connexion with the personal endings.

I have been long in doubt as to whether the initial म in the 3rd pers. of the active imperfect should be elongated. If we suppose the verb to be conjugated regularly, the coalition of the temporal augment with the initial vowel of the root will of course increase the quantity; and we thus, in fact, find the elongation not only in the Sanskrit imperf. आसीत् and perf. आस , but also in the Vedic आः , and in the Zend aōgha and ās^1 ; but I perceive in Westergaard's Radices that there is also a Vedic असन् for the 3rd pers. sing. of the imperfect; where, notwithstanding that the verb is of the second class, the short a is introduced between the base and the personal characteristic, (as it is introduced likewise in आदन् from अद् , "to eat";) and I am the rather inclined to adopt this for the true correspondent of the Cuneiform aha , (erat), as it will enable us to distinguish between the singular and plural number by a difference of initial quantity, and as there is moreover a third form in Zend of the active imperfect, aghat , which agrees with the Vedic asat in retaining a short vowel at the commencement. I suggest, accordingly, that aha in the singular may be for असन् and aghat , and āha in the plural for आसन् and aōghēn^2 .

¹ For a full comparison of the Zend and Sans. forms of the past tenses of the substantive verb, see Burnouf's Yaçna, Alph. Zend, p. cxviii, and p. 434, note 290.

² See Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 300. It is curious that I do not find this form of asat , either in Bopp, Lassen, or Burnouf. The Vedic form which they invariably quote is ās . See Lassen's Ind. Bib., tom. III., p. 78; and Bopp's Sans. Gram. p. 331. (I have since found asat in the Rig Veda, Hymn ix., l. 5. See Rosen's Notes, p. xxviii.)

³ On further consideration I am disposed to think that this distinction of quantity between the 3rd pers. sing. and plur. cannot be maintained. In the Vedic असन् , csat , the temporal augment has evidently been dropped, as is very frequently the case in that dialect, and the same explanation is to be given of the Zend aghat , which is formed without the augment, according to the almost universal rule of that language; as āham stands for आसं , āsam , so āha in the sing. must be for āsāt , and in the plur. for āsan . The latter term, indeed, actually exists, and the former, (as Bopp has remarked, Comp. Gr. s. 532,) was probably the true and original form of the modern आसीत् , āsīt . The object of the Sans. in irregularly introducing a conjunctive vowel after the root, (notwithstanding that the verb is of the 2nd class,) has been to prevent the personal characteristics from

I take the forms of the middle imperfect from the regular Sanskrit conjugation of **अस्** preceded by the preposition **अति**, *dhata* and *dmahya* answering to *ásata* and *ásmahi* in **अवासात** and **अवासाहि**. There is only occasion to remark, that in the Cuneiform *dhata* the terminal vowel is optionally elongated, and that the Sanskrit *ásmahi*, if it occurred in the Vedas, would probably be written *ásmasi*, (as we have *masi* for *maśi* in the present), the termination in *si* being the regular correspondent of the Cuneiform *hya*¹. The 3rd pers. sing. of the middle imperfect does not, I believe, occur in the inscriptions, but it would no doubt be written *ástá*, for the Sanskrit *ásta* in **अवास्त**².

We have hardly a sufficient number of examples in the inscriptions to be able to determine with any certainty the rules upon which are formed the different tenses of the subjunctive mood; but with regard to the present tense of that mood, we may I think presume that it is distinguished from the indicative by the employment of a servile *a* prefixed to the personal characteristics. If the verb accordingly be of the second class, we shall have for the terminations of the 3rd pers. sing. *tiya* in the indicative, and *atiya* in the subjunctive, while in verbs of the first

being lost, but there are only a few roots in the language, or **अस्**, "to be," **अद्**, "to eat," and the class **हृदादि** in which the peculiarity is found. In the old Persian the preservation of the personal endings in *ásat*, *ásas*, and *ásan*, was impossible, owing to the orthographical law of elision of the silent terminals; but the conjunctive vowel, which was first used with a view to that preservation, has been nevertheless retained. I am not sure that *áoḡhat* and *áoḡhên* are genuine forms of the active imperfect of the indic. mood in Zend; the forms of *aḡhat* and *aḡhên* without the augment of past time are more regular, but still it is with the former that we must compare the Cuneiform *áha*. See Comp. Gr. s. 530 sqq., and Yaçna, Notes, p. cxiv.

¹ Bopp, however, considers *mahi* in the 1st pers. plur. of the mid. imperf. as an abbreviated form of *madhi*, comparing it with the Greek *μεθα* and the Zend *maidhé*, in the same way as he derives *mahé* in the primary forms from *madhé*. It is perhaps, indeed, only in the active pres. tense that there is any reason for supposing the Vedic dialect to have employed a termination in *masi*. Compare Bopp's Comp. Gr. ss. 439, 472, and 536, with Yaçna, Notes, p. lxx.

² I am not aware that we have the middle imperfect of the sub. verb standing alone, either in Zend or in the Vedic or classical Sanskrit. I follow Wilkins, (p. 187,) and Bopp's Comp. Gr. s. 544, for the forms which occur in composition, supposing the verb to be conjugated regularly in this tense according to the second class.

conjugation, the respective endings will be *atiya* and *átiya*. A similar rule also appears to have prevailed in the Vedic Sanskrit and in Zend; *bhaváti* in the one, and *mairýáiti* in the other, affording examples of the introduction of an additional *a* before the personal suffix of the subjunctive present¹.

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡𐽢𐽣𐽤𐽥𐽦𐽧𐽨𐽩𐽪𐽫𐽬𐽭𐽮𐽯𐽰𐽱𐽲𐽳𐽴𐽵𐽶𐽷𐽸𐽹𐽺𐽻

worship¹;" and according, therefore, to the quantity of the Cuneiform prefix will that meaning be extended or reversed. Referring, then, to the passage in which the word occurs, and which I have translated literally under the head *Abicharish*, I think that I perceive a difference between the sacrificial worship of the Magi and the religious rites of the people, which consisted exclusively of certain outward "observances" (*abicharish*), of "chanting" (*gaithám*), and of "reverential adoration" (*mániyam*). These popular and simple rites, accordingly, I conjecture to have been named *ayad(a)nā*, from their being unaccompanied by sacrifices or oblations², and such may we perhaps suppose to have been the form of worship re-established by Darius after the overthrow of the Magi, and the fearful retribution with which that class was visited—a retribution of which the memory so long survived in the annual feast of the *Μαγοφόνια*³. I will only add, that the change of the Sanskrit sonant palatal to the sonant dental is according to an acknowledged law of permutation; that I have suggested the introduction of a short *a* between the root and the suffix in *na*, as I am doubtful if the Cuneiform language will admit of a hard group such as *dn*; and that *ayad(a)nā* must be the accus. plur. of a feminine noun of the first declension, the relative *tyá* which follows being necessarily of that gender.

𐎠 𐎡𐎴 𐎠𐎹 𐎠𐎶 𐎠𐎶 𐎠𐎶 AYASTÁ, [Col. I., l. 47, p. 203, and Col. III., l. 4, p. 228, and lines 42, 43, p. 233,] *Cum*. This is a preposition governing the accus. case, which is I believe without

¹ For an analysis and explanation of these Zend terms, see *Yagna*, pages 7 and 21.

² Herodotus particularly mentions the absence of all the paraphernalia of sacrificial worship in the devotions which the Persians paid to the Gods, *οὔτε βωμοὺς ποιεῦνται, οὔτε πῦρ ἀνακαίουσι μέλλοντες θύειν· οὐ σπονδῇ χρέωνται, οὐκ αὐλῶ, οὐ στέμμασι, οὐκ οὐλῇσι*, but he still asserts that a victim was immolated, while the sacred chaunt was being performed, *μάγος ἀνὴρ παρεστὼς ἐπαείδει θεογονίην*. Lib. I., c. 132. In support of my theory I may further observe, that while the Assyrian and Babylonian sculptures abound with representations of sacrificial worship, there is not a single trace at Persepolis of the immolation of victims.

³ The *Magophonia*, which is commemorated by Herod. l. 3, c. 79, as well as by Ctesias and Agathias, has been a fruitful source of difficulty to these modern writers, who suppose Darius to have been the founder rather than the subverter, of Magism. See particularly the bungling explanation given by the Abbé Foucher, in his Paper on the Second Zoroaster, in the *Mém. de l'Académie*, tom. XLVI. p. 458. (12mo Edit.)

any correspondent either in Zend or Sanskrit, but which may be perhaps allied to the Latin *justa*. *Ayastá*, in the inscriptions, appears to imply "agency" or "conjunction," and to be used indifferently either before or after the noun¹. In the first paragraph of the third column at Behistun, *ayastá avam kdrám* is translated in the Median, as if the phrase had been *hadá avá kdrá*, "with that force," and *kdrám ayastá*, in the seventh paragraph of the same column, has apparently a similar meaning. The other phrase in which the word occurs, *hauva ayastá 'wdi-p(a)shiyam akutá*, I shall consider hereafter.

𐎠𐎡𐎹𐎶𐎠𐎡𐎹𐎶𐎠𐎡𐎹𐎶 ARAKADRISH, [Col. I., l. 37, p. 201,] *Aracadres*. The name of a mountain, or perhaps of a range of mountains, which I conjecture to have been to the east of Persis Proper, and from whence arose the famous impostor Smerdis Magus. We are perhaps justified in believing the first element of the name to be the Semitic 𐤀𐤓, for although that term was introduced into Zend in its full integrity², yet the initial aspirate was equally lost in the Cuneiform orthography of *Armina* for the Chaldee ܐܪܡܝܢܐ, and the same corruption is observable in the Pehlevi 𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀, *Ar-Parsin*, ("the mountain of Persis,") and in the name of *El burz*, ("the lofty mountain,") 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀, *Arburz*, in Pehlevi, and 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀, *Arburz*, in Parsi³. *Kadrish* may be compared either with the Celtic "*Cadar*," or with the Sanskrit कच्छ, "a cloud," the entire name according to the latter etymology having the same signification as the

¹ We have another example in the inscriptions of the post-position of the particle in the employment of *patiya*, and the same construction is sufficiently common both in Zend and Sanskrit.

² The expression *harañm dërësañm* occurs in three passages of the Zend Avesta as the name of the Elburz in the accusative case, and 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 is again found in its proper sense of "a mountain," in the hymn to Mithra, (*taró harañm açnaoiti*, "montem transiit,") given in Burnouf's *Yagna, Notes, &c.*, p. lxvi.

³ That the *Ar* or *Har* of this name signifies "a mountain," I shall show under the head *Armina*.

⁴ For observations on the Pehlevi *Ar Parsin* and *Ar Burz*, see Muller's Essay in the *Journ. Asiat.*, for April, 1839, p. 337.

Belút Tágh, of the Jaghatái Turkish. The name of *Arakadrish* is neither mentioned by classical authors, nor has it survived in the modern geography of Persia. I suppose it, however, to have belonged to one of the mountain chains on the eastern borders of *Kermán*, for we find in one passage of the inscriptions that it was in the country of *Pishiyá'uwáddyá*¹, and we learn from another, col. III., para. 7, that a certain Persian rebel having retired to the latter country after a defeat, returned again to attack the Lieutenant of Darius in Persis Proper, and was a second time routed at *Parga*, which I identify with the modern فهرج, *Fahraj*². There is perhaps an allusion to these Eastern Magi, distinct as I imagine from the Median tribe of Herodotus, in the famous passage of Pliny: "Ad Orientem Magi obtinent Pasa-gardas castellum in quo Cyri sepulchrum est, et horum Ecbatana oppidum, translatum ab Dario rege, ad montes³;" their city of Ecbatana which was removed by Darius, either on his conquest of Smerdis or on the second Persian revolt under *Vahyazdata*, being in these very mountains of *Arakadrish*.

𐎠𐎼𐎫𐎡𐎴 𐎠𐎡𐎧𐎫𐎡𐎴

ARAKH-A, [Col. III., l. 77, p. 238,] *Aracus*.

ARAKH-AM, [Col. III., l. 81, p. 238,] *Aracum*.

Arakha was the name of an Armenian rebel who threw Baby-lonia into revolt, pretending to be Nabochodrossor, the son of Nabonidus. He is exhibited at Behistun among the captive figures of the triumphal tablet. The etymology of the name is, I presume, to be sought in the Armenian language rather than the Sanskrit, and I venture therefore to compare it with *արքայ*, *arkai*, "a king⁴."

I consider it of some interest to find that a native of Armenia could personate a Babylonian prince, inasmuch as the fact affords presumptive evidence that there must have been a certain affinity

¹ I have sometimes surmised that in this name we have the vernacular orthography of the Greek *Πασαργάδαι*, but there are strong historical objections to the identification, which I shall state hereafter.

² *Fahraj* would be the Arabized form of the Persian *Pahrag*. The name still attaches to a place between Shiraz and Kermán.

³ I conjecture this passage to be improperly pointed in the printed editions of Pliny. By placing a stop after *rege*, we may read,—“These Magi had a city named Ecbatana in the mountains, which was removed by King Darius.” See Pliny, l. VI., c. 26.

⁴ The Persian orthography of the name is reproduced with little variation in the Median and Babylonian transcripts.

between the races; but I dare not at the same time venture to affirm, that the connexion was so near as to render the Armenian language of any real assistance in interpreting the ancient Babylonian.

𐎠 𐎶 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎶𐎵 ARTAKHSHATRÁ, [Ins. No. 19, passim, p. 341, 342,] *Artaxerxes*. Under this form we have the name which the Greeks, following a Babylonian model, rendered by Ἀρταξέρξης, and which was stated by Herodotus to signify μέγας ἀρχίος¹. It is composed of two elements, *Artā*, which was certainly used in ancient Persian as a transcendental particle, but which in its origin should be compared, according to Burnouf, with the Zend 𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵, *ērēta*, or 𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵, *arēta*, a past participle derived from *ērē*, (Sans. 𑖦𑖳,) “to gain” or “acquire;” and *khshatrā*, which only differs from the Sanskrit 𑖦𑖳𑖦𑖳, and Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵, *khshathra*, in the terminal elongation that is caused by the addition of an affix of agency. I shall examine the origin and application of the latter term at some length in another part of the Vocabulary, and will only observe, therefore, at present, that as the verbal root 𑖦𑖳, to which it is to be referred, signifies merely “to screen” or “defend,” it may be applied with equal propriety to “a king” or to “a warrior.”

The *Artakhshatrā* of Persepolis is certainly Artaxerxes Ochus, and I presume that the *Adakhchashcha* of the Venice Vase refers to the same monarch, for it seems impossible to believe so grievous a corruption of the true Persian orthography to have been admitted at any early period of the Achæmenian line; the different forms under which the name of Artaxerxes appears in the contemporary and subsequent languages of the East,

¹ Lib. VI., c. 98.

² Burnouf has some good remarks on the use and derivation of *ērēta* or *arta*, in his Commentary on the Yaçna, p. 474; Lassen, also, in his last Cuneiform Memoir, p. 162, compares with the same term, the title of Ἀρταίος, which Herodotus applies to the ancient Persian race, (lib. VII., c. 61); but which rather appears from Stephen and Hesychius to have been a particular epithet given in the vernacular dialect to the heroes of Persian romance. See these authors in voce, and compare also the explanation given by Hesychius of Ἀρτράς; μέγας καὶ λαμπρὸς.

In the Inscription of Artaxerxes Ochus, the orthography of *Artakhshatrâ* is used indifferently for the nominat. and genitive, which must of course be considered a barbarism.

The name of one of the generals of Darius who was employed in reducing a revolt in Persis, but who is not, I believe, to be recognized in Grecian history. The first element of the title, *Arta*, is the same as that which occurs in *Artakshashtrá*, and which I have explained to be identical in its origin with the Zend *arəta*; while the complement *vardiya*, may per-

² These forms are taken from the inscription on the Venice Vase, noticed in p. 348 in the former chapter, and of which I have since found a detailed account in Westergaard's Median Memoir, p. 420. The difficulty of reading the Babylonian name arises from the doubtful figure of the fourth character.

haps be allied to the Sanskrit वृत्, Zend 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌, *vrēto*, and Pazend 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌, *vart*, the epithet being formed by the addition of the adjectival suffix in *ya* to the root वृत्, and signifying "celebrated". In the name of Phraortes, we have, however, a term which is more immediately connected with the Sanskrit वृत्, *vrit*, and if therefore it be considered necessary to distinguish *vartish* with the 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 from *vardiya* with the 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌, we must refer the latter to the Sanskrit वहे, "to be pre-eminent," the Devanagari व being a regular correspondent for the Cuneiform sonant dental 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌, and the meaning of the entire name *Artavardiya*, which I suppose to be that of "very celebrated," being hardly affected by the change of etymology.

𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 ARDASTÁNA, [No. 10, p. 314.] *Artastonia*? In the notes to the window-inscription of the Palace of Darius I have examined this word at length, and I have added some explanations under the head of *athagaina*. I am by no means satisfied that I have rightly interpreted the legend, but if *Ardastána* be a proper name as I have before conjectured, the grammatical condition of the term must be necessarily that of the ablat. or genitive case sing. of a noun of the fifth class of the eighth declension. *Arda*, with which I compare the Zend *ērēdhwa*, is probably derived immediately from the Sanskrit वृत्, "to increase," and *stán*, (nom. *stá*, ablat. or genitive, *stána* for

¹ For a comparison of the Sanskrit *vṛtta*, Zend *vrēto*, and Pazend *vart*, see Burnouf's *Yagna*, p. 435, Note 290. The Sanskrit *vṛtta*, "selected," which orthographically answers to the Zend *vrēto*, cannot be compared with the Cuneiform *vardiya*, for in the latter term the dental is radical, and does not belong to a participial suffix.

² I once thought that we had in this name the title of Ἀρυστῶνη, the favourite queen of Darius, (see Herod. l. VII., c. 69,) but I have been compelled to abandon the idea, as the noun cannot be of the feminine gender.

³ See especially the note marked ² under the head *Athagaina*.

⁴ Jacquet recognized the Zend *ērēdhwa* in the Ὀρθοκορυβάνης, "the high mountains" of Herodotus, (l. III., c. 92,) and he was probably right, for the district still retains the name of *Bálá Girtueh*, which has the same meaning. I believe also, that we have the Zend *ērēdhwa*, or Cuneiform *arda*, both in the name of *Ardastán* which attaches to the mountains west of Persepolis, and in *Ardabil*, "the hills of the shepherds." In other Persian geographical names, such

stánas) may be formed with the suffix in ॢ from the Sanskrit ॢ, which gives the Cuneiform accusatives, *upastám* and *abishtám*, and from which we have the locative affix ستان in modern Persian. *Ardastá*, therefore, as a proper name would appear to have precisely the same signification as the عليجا, "high in place," of the modern language. Ultimately, no doubt, we shall obtain a certain explanation of the window legend of Persepolis from the Babylonian transcript, where the order of the words is inverted to suit a Semitic construction, but I cannot at present venture to draw any argument from that source.

𐎶 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 ARABÁYA, [Col. I., l. 15, p. 197, &c.,] *Arabia*. The name of the country of Arabia. Compare the Heb. ארבה, Arab. عرب, and Gr. 'Αραβία'. The termination, which is also found in the name of *Mudráya* for Egypt, is perhaps allied to the Sanskrit suffix in ॢ, and has a simple power of attribution. In the inscriptions the name of Arabia is sometimes introduced between those of Babylon and Assyria, sometimes between Assyria and Egypt, and I think, therefore, we may suppose the title to apply to the Mesopotamian Desert and the basin of the Euphrates, which have always been inhabited by Arab tribes, rather than to the vast Southern Peninsula. The Jews, in the same way, whose geographical notions were very limited, designated as Arabia, or the country of the Arabs, the region immediately joining Palestine, and stretching southwards to the Red Sea².

as *Ardakán*, *Ardashir*, *Ardashat*, *Ardabád*, we have probably the old *Arta*, or Zend *arēta*, the change of the dental from the surd to the sonant grade being agreeable to the genius of the modern language.

¹ There is a very remarkable difference in the Median orthography of this name, as it is given in Westergaard's published copy of the Nakhsh-e-Rustam Inscription, and as I find it in Dittel's manuscript copy of the same writing, a difference which is of much importance in regard to the Median alphabet, but which I am unable at present to resolve. In the Babylonian transcript the name is unfortunately imperfect.

² For remarks on the name of Arabia, see *Ges. Lex.* in voce ארבה.

𐤀𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤀𐤁𐤓𐤓 ArbIRÁ-YÁ, [Col. II., l. 90, p. 226,] *Arbeld*. We have, I believe, in the term *Arbirá*, the name of the city which was written by the Greeks Ἀρβηλα, and which retains to the present day the title of *Arbil*. That it was a site of some consequence in antiquity, we may infer from the expression of Strabo, "καρούλιαν ἀξιόλογον¹," and from the testimony of Dio Cassius to its having been a place of royal sepulture under the Parthians², as well as from the imposing appearance which the great mound still presents; and the inference is confirmed by our finding that Darius after defeating the Sagartian rebel *Chitratakhma* on the confines probably of Media, sent him to that city to undergo capital punishment.

Whether the original name was written with the *r* or the *l* I cannot pretend to decide. The Median writing employs for the orthography of the last syllable a character which may be presumed to have the same power as the Persian 𐭮𐭲, but on the other hand we have, I think, in the 𐤀𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤀𐤁𐤓𐤓 of the book of Ezra, an instance of the name being written by the Semites in a very early age, almost as it is pronounced at present³.

The term *Arbirá* must be considered as a feminine noun of the 1st declension, and the locative *Arbiráyá* must stand for *Arbiráyás*, the termination in *yás*, as I have suggested under the

¹ Lib. XVI., page 737. The Greeks had a tradition that Arbela was founded by a certain Arbelus, one of the Athenian leaders who followed Medea into Asia. See tom. V., p. 160, Note 1, of the admirable translation of Strabo published by the French Academy. Under the lower empire the site was known as Ἀλεξανδρίαν. See Bekker's Theophrast., p. 219.

² Dio Cass., l. LXXVIII., c. 1; Curtius also, (l. V., c. 1,) mentions that Arbela contained the royal treasures.

³ Chap. IV., v. 9. The initial 𐤀 substituted for 𐤁 in this title, I suppose to be the Chaldee demonstrative pronoun, or rather article, which is, I believe, to be frequently recognized in Assyrian and Babylonian names. Compare in Ptolemy, Τερσάφη or Σκάφη, (mod. اسكان Askaf); Διδούγωνα or Δίγωνα, mod. دقل Diklah,) &c., &c. Gesenius, in voce, does not venture to identify the Tarpelites; he merely compares the Ταρφαλαῖοι of the Septuagint, and it is certainly against the suggestion I have offered that the Syriac translation of the verse in Ezra employs the orthography of ܐܪܒܝܪܐ, where the *l* is entirely lost.

head *Athurdyá*, being an older form than the *यौ* of the classical Sanskrit.

𐎠 𐎡 𐎢 𐎣 𐎤 𐎥

ARMIN-A, [Col. I., l. 15, p. 197,] *Armenia*.

ARMIN-AM, [Col. II., lines 30 and 32, p. 218, &c.,] *Armeniam*.

ARMIN-IYA, [Col. II., l. 29, p. 218, Col. IV., l. 29, p. 241,] *Armenius*.

ARMIN-AIYA (?), [Col. II., lines 59 and 63, p. 222,] *Armenid*.

ARMANIY-AIYA, [Col. II., l. 34, p. 218, l. 39, p. 219, l. 44, p. 220,] *Armenid*.

In the Cuneiform Armina we have the original of the Greek *Ἀρμενία*, and Arabic *أرمينية*. Bochart (Phaleg, l. i., c. 3, col. 20,) has shown that the Chaldee Paraphrast renders the *מְנִי* of Jeremiah by *מְנִי מְנִי*, and as the same country is named *Murvas* by Nicolaus Damascenus, he infers that the first syllable is the Semitic *מְנִי*, signifying "a mountain". That this term was actually in use not only in Pehlevi, (compare *Arparsin*, *Arburz*, &c.,) but also in Zend, I have observed under the head *Arakadriśh*; yet I hardly know how to account for the initial aspirate, which was retained in Zend, being dropt in the language of the inscriptions, except by supposing the names in which the word occurs, to have been adopted into the ancient Persian according to the popular pronunciation, and without any reference to their Semitic etymology¹.

The inflected forms of *Arminam* for the accus., and *Arminiya* for the ethnic title (the adjectival suffix in *iya*, for *i* or *ya*, being added immediately to the base) are perfectly regular, but there is

¹ Gesenius compares with the Heb. *גִּרָּה* the Gr. *ῥος*, and Slavic *gora*; but if the latter term be admitted as of cognate origin, we must also include in the list the numerous correspondents which exist for the Sans. *गिरि* throughout the family of the Arian languages.

² I believe that the name of *Armani* occurs repeatedly in the Medo-Assyrian Inscriptions of Van, which was actually within the limits of the ancient Armenia; and yet we have there what may be supposed to be the vernacular reading without the initial aspiration.

a difficulty with regard to the locative which I have cursorily observed in the notes to the second column at Behistun, but which will hardly admit of grammatical explanation. In the eleventh paragraph of that column, we appear in two passages to have the orthography of *Arminaiya*¹, the inflexion in *aiya* standing for the Sanskrit *ꣳ*, and Zend *ꣳ*, as the locative affix of the first declens. masculine; but in several other places the same case is certainly represented by *Armaniyaiya*, which must necessarily be referred to a nominative *Armaniya*; and on what principle the theme should thus follow the distinct forms of *Armina* and *Armaniya*, I am at a loss to conceive².

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡

𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎹𐎠𐎹𐎡𐎹𐎠𐎹𐎡𐎹

ARSHĀM-A, [Col. I., line 4, 5, p. 196,] *Arsames*.

ARSHĀM-AHYÁ, [Col. I., lines 3 and 5, p. 195 and 196,] *Arsamis*.

ARSHĀM-A, [Ins. No. 19, l. 26, p. 342,] *Arsamis*.

The name of the grandfather of Darius, which was written by the Greeks 'Αρσάμης'. In the inscription of Artaxerxes Ochus, Hystaspes and Arsames are named as if they had been private individuals, but Darius himself would seem to claim the royal character for his entire line of ancestry up to the third generation above Achæmenes. Etymologically, *Arshâma* is probably a cognate title with 'Αρσης and 'Αρσάκης, with the ارش of Persian romance, and with the *Arshashang* of the Zend theogony²; and among the Armenians it continued in use as a royal name, as late as the Christian era³. It may be referred, I think, to the Sanskrit अरि, which has produced अरि, "a sage," and आरि, "venerable," and it would appear also to form one of the elements of the Cuneiform *Khshayârshâ*. The true genitive is *Arshâmahyâ*, where the termination in *hyâ* answers to the Sanskrit स्य, and Zend 𐎶𐎵, but in the degraded language of the time of Artaxerxes Ochus the inflexion had been lost, and we have accordingly the barbarous phrase *Arshâma nâma putra*, for "the son of one named Arsames."

𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎹𐎠𐎹𐎡𐎹𐎠𐎹𐎡𐎹

ARIKA, [Col. I., l. 22, p. 199, l. 33, p. 200, and Col. IV., l. 38, p. 245, l. 63, p. 252,] *Hæreticus? Magicus?*

In each of the four passages at Behistun, in which this word

¹ See Herod. lib. VII., cap. 11 and 224.

² M. Burnouf, however, will not admit the *r* in *Arshashang* to be a radical letter; he believes it to be introduced before the hard sibilant, in many names in Zend, and in this name in particular, by a certain natural tendency of articulation, (see Yaçna, pp. 437 and 470); and the combined examples of *Ashaka* on the Eastern coins of Arsaces, (see Cunningham's Plates, No. 15) of *Asak*, the Parthian capital mentioned by Isidore of Charax, and of the Persian اشاک *Ashak*, are apparently in favour of his theory. The Median orthography of Arsames is also, I think, *Ashâma*, an aspirate almost always replacing the *r* in Median before a sibilant.

³ See St. Martin's Armenia, tom. I., p. 411.

occurs, it is certainly used in an evil sense, but it is quite impossible to determine with any precision the nature of the evil which it serves to indicate. Referring however to the distinction which is apparently drawn in the 14th paragraph of the first column at Behistun, between the sacrificial worship of the Magi proscribed by Darius, and the pure and primitive faith which he re-established in Persia¹, I am inclined to think that under the name *arika*, he alludes to the followers of the former heresy; and on this ground I compare the term with the Sanskrit अरि, which, although derived from अर, signifying merely "to praise," is used especially to denote a "*mantra*" or "magical invocation." The *Arika* of Darius it must be observed, were the particular objects of persecution. Their predominance in the state paved the way for the Magian revolution. Upon their extirpation depended, according to the address of the monarch to his posterity, the future integrity of the empire. That he was not one of them he numbers among the virtues which had secured to him the favour of Ormazd. All these indications point, as I think, to some prevailing heresy, of which Darius was the inveterate enemy; and when we remember that it was this monarch who instituted the feast of the *Mayofónia*, and who is still revered by the Zoroastrians as the reformer of the national religion, we cannot avoid connecting the *arika* with a proscribed Magism. As a further proof that the term denoted some peculiar sect, and was not used in the general sense of "an evil doer," or "one careless of religion" (the initial 𐎠 being the privative particle, and अर being used, as in Sanskrit, in a good sense,) I may add, that the Median language adopted the exact Persian word, as if it had been a proper name, instead of employing a synonym².

The termination in *a* I suppose to be the attributive suffix added to the nominative अरि, in order to form an adjective.

¹ See above, under the head *Ayad(a)na*.

² I have the Median *arikka* in the translation of the thirteenth paragraph of the fourth column at Behistun. The term also occurs in the same evil sense in line twenty-four of the Median Inscription (H) on the outer wall at Persepolis, where however Westergaard (see his Copenhagen Memoir, p. 411,) has altogether mistaken the meaning.

𑀓 𑀘 𑀓 𑀕 ARIYA, [Ins. No. 6, l. 14, p. 292,] *Arius*. I have little to add to what Burnouf and Lassen have written on the origin and application of this name¹. Derived from the root 𑀓, and with the primary signification of "a man", it appears in the earliest ages to have been adopted as a proper name by the inhabitants of Central Asia. When the first colonists of this stock descended from Meru to the banks of the Sutlej, they gave the title of *A'rya vartta* to the country of their adoption², and on the subsequent introduction of caste, the same name, by a modification of the initial letter, served to distinguish the Brahmins (𑀓𑀕𑀓𑀓) from the agriculturists (𑀓𑀕𑀓𑀓). A kindred race migrated probably almost simultaneously from the same great nursery of nations to the westward; they were the progenitors of the Persians, (perhaps also of the Medes,) and came in contact, as I imagine, in their new abodes, with Scythic aborigines³. The traditions of their exodus and gradual colonization of Eastern Persia are preserved in the first Fargard of the Vendidad, where their primitive abode is named 𑀓𑀕𑀓𑀓 𑀓𑀕𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓, *Airyānēṃ vaējo*, "the source (or native land) of the Arians⁴."

In Persia, the title has been ever since retained as the true ethnic appellation; we have thus the *Airyō shayanēm* and *Airyāo danghāvō* of the Zend Avesta⁵, the "Aria of Hellanicus" applied to Persia, the "Apoi of Herodotus" applied to the Medes. The

¹ See in particular Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*, p. 35; Burnouf's *Yaçna*, p. 460, Note 325; and Wilson's *Ariana Antiqua*, p. 121.

² Compare the Persian ایر or ایل, and I think also Gr. ἱς, and Heb. אִירָא. The Lat. *vir*; Gr. *hērōs*; Scyth. *olōp*; Celt. *Fear*, *Gwr*, *Wr*, &c., are probably referable to another root, Sans. वीर, although Gesenius connects them. See Robinson's edition of the Heb. Lex., p. 50.

³ *A'rya-bhūmi* and *A'rya-desa* are also usual in Sanskrit in the same sense.

⁴ I suppose these wars to be figured in Greek fable by the conflict between Perseus and Cepheus. In Persian romance, *Feridūn* was probably the leader of the Arian immigration. The old Scythic speech is that I suspect of the Median tablets.

⁵ The Zend 𑀓𑀕𑀓𑀓 *vaejo*, answering to the Sans. वीजः.

⁶ See the quotations in Burnouf's *Yaçna*, Notes, &c., p. lxi.

⁷ *Frag.* 166, Ed. Müller.

⁸ Lib. VII., c. 62.

earliest Greek author, I believe, who employs the name in its true catholic sense is Eudemus, a disciple of Aristotle, whose famous passage regarding the Magian religion commences with *Μάγοι δὲ καὶ πᾶν τὸ Ἀπειρον γένος*¹. Under the Parthians, who were probably a Scytho-Arian race, the title had lost something of its general application. It occurs under various forms in the writings of many of the Greek and Latin historians and geographers, but usually with a special reference either to a small district of Media, the Arabic *Arrán*², or to the countries intermediate between Persia and India³. Strabo alone appears to have had some idea of its full ethnographical import⁴. When the Sassanians, however, succeeded to power, they adopted in their inscriptions, on their coins, and in their edicts preserved by the historians of Armenia⁵, the well-known epithet of "Kings of *Airán* and *Anirán*," names which certainly referred to the *Arian* and *un-Arian* races, (for the words are written in Parthian, *Arián*, and *Andrián*), and which as certainly produced the title of *Irán* ایران, by which Persia has been classically and familiarly designated ever since the Arab conquest⁶.

¹ Quoted by Nicol. Damasc., in *Libro περὶ Ἀρχῶν*; I follow the text as it is given in Hyde, p. 292.

² See Steph. de Urb., in voce *Ἀριάνα*; in my Mem. on Ecbatana I have also shown its application to the Median Capital. See Journ. Royal Geog. Soc., v. X., p. 139.

³ For the Eastern *Ariana*, see Plin., l. VI. c. 23; Dionys. Per., 8. 1098; Ælian. de Animal., XVI., c. 16; Tac. Annal., l. XI., c. 10, &c. We must be careful not to confound *Ariana* with *Apia* or *Herat*, in Zend 𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀, and in the inscriptions *Hariva*.

⁴ See throughout the second chapter of Strabo's fifteenth book.

⁵ For these notices, see De Sacy's Mem. sur Div. Ant. de la Perse, p. 48. St. Martin's Armenia, tom. I., p. 274, and Quatremère's Hist. des Mongols, tom. I., p. 241, Note 76.

⁶ The epenthetic *i* was introduced into the Sassanian *Airán* through the Zend, agreeably to a law of orthography which obtains in the latter language.

⁷ I take the Parthian *Arián* and *An-árián* from the bilingual inscription of Sapor, in the cave of *Hajábád*, which affords several other very valuable readings.

⁸ The names of ایران and عراق are undoubtedly identical, as has been shown by Müller, in his Essai sur le Pehlevi, Jour. Asiat. Soc., tom. VII., p. 298. I think I discover the reason of the interchange of the Pehlevi terminations in *án* and *ák*, which is incontestable, in a certain guttural power inherent in the Babylonian nasal, both the one form and the other being referable to a primitive *ánk*. The name of *Irán*, however, must have been very early subjected to this corruption,

SINGULAR.

	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Nom.	<i>Hauva</i> , (Passim.)	<i>Hauva</i> , Col. III., l. 11, p. 230.	<i>Ava</i> , Col. I., l. 20, p. 198.
Acc.	<i>Avam</i> , (Passim.)	_____	<i>Ava</i> , Col. I., l. 62, p. 205.
Gen.	<i>Avahyá</i> , Col. I., l. 29, p. 200.	_____	_____

Suffixed.

G., D., or Ins., *-shaiya*.Accus. *-shim*.

PLURAL.

Nom.	_____	<i>Avá</i> , Insc. No. 6, l. 39, p. 298.	_____
Acc.	<i>Avaiya</i> , Col. IV., l. 69, p. 253.	_____	<i>Avá</i> , Col. IV., l. 74, p. 254, and l. 77, p. 256.
Dat.	<i>Abish</i> (?) Col. I., l. 86, p. 211.	_____	_____
Gen.	<i>Avaiśhm</i> , Col. IV., l. 51, p. 249.	_____	_____

Suffixed.

G., D. or Ins., *-śhm*. . . *-śhm*.Accu. *-shim* or *-shish*? . . *-shim*. . . (a) *dish* (?)

It has been well observed that, "what we call personal pronouns are, or at least originally were, nothing more than demonstratives¹." In the terms which represent the nominatives of the 1st and 2nd pers. the demonstrative etymology is not so immediately discernible; but in many languages the pronoun of the 3rd person is a word which may be also used indifferently to express "this" or "that." In this respect the Zend, the language of the inscriptions, and the modern Persian are entirely similar. Unprovided with a distinctive pronoun answering to the Sanskrit *सः*, they employ the demonstrative *ava*, (Zend

¹ See an excellent philological article reviewing "Prichard on the Celtic Languages," in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. LVII., No. CXIII., p. 98.

𐎧𐎡𐎴, Pers. ۱) for "he" "she" "it"; but the Cuneiform is in so far superior to the others, that it has adopted a foreign term for the nom. sing. of the masc. and fem. gender, and that it also makes use of a suffix, which is subject to inflexion, and which is probably founded on an earlier demonstrative form, appropriated to the 3rd person. In a mere vocabulary I cannot pretend to follow out these relations with any thing like philological detail, but in noticing the various forms which occur in the inscriptions it may be useful to indicate their leading analogies.

Hauva. I have not yet been able to assure myself whether the etymology of this term is to be sought in the Sanskrit **सः**, or whether it was not immediately borrowed from the Semitic **הוּא**. The probability, however, is, I think, in favour of the latter identification; for 1st, *Hauva* denotes equally the masc. and fem. like the **הוּא** of the Pentateuch¹, whereas if we supposed the term to be compounded of **ס:** and **ס:**, we ought to have *hāuvā* for the nom. of the fem. gender; 2nd, although *hauva* is preserved in its full integrity, when as a fem. nom. it is united to a suffix, (compare *hauvamaiya*, "ea mihi," (Col. III., l. 11, p. 230); *hauvataiya*, "ea tibi," (Ins. No. 6, l. 57, p. 310); and *hauvachiya*, "ea-ce," (Ins. No. 4, line 23, 24, p. 282,) still as a masculine nom. it is in a similar position contracted into *hau*², (compare *haushaiya*, "is illi," (Ins. No. 3, l. 3, p. 273,) the final **𐎧𐎡𐎴** being thus apparently a euphonic developement and not a radical letter as in the Sanskrit **सः**; and, 3rd, if we followed a Sanskrit etymology, and read the term *hauva* with an

¹ For some valuable remarks on the Zend *ava*, see Burnouf's *Yağna*, Alphab. Zend, p. lxiii, and Note A, p. iii, of the *Notes et Eclaircissemens*. Gesenius is wrong, I think, in comparing 𐎧𐎡𐎴 with the Heb. **הוּא**. The Persian word, like the Cuneiform *ava*, and Zend **𐎧𐎡𐎴**, comes from the pronominal root *a*, and not from the demonstrative sibilant modified to an aspirate.

² See Robinson's Gesenius, in voce **הוּא**, p. 270, where the double employment of the Hebrew pronoun is particularly noticed.

³ I cannot certainly affirm that the distinction between *hau* and *hauva* in composition is intended to mark a distinction of gender, for at Behistun, col. 2, l. 79, p. 226, we have the term *hauvamaiya*, "ille mihi," referring to a masc. antecedent; but still the example of *haushaiya* may be held to prove the terminal **𐎧𐎡𐎴** to be euphonic.

aspiration for the second Devanagari dental sibilant, we must suppose the final element to give an intensive signification, which is sufficiently apparent, where the Cuneiform $\langle \text{𐎶} \text{𐎶} \rangle$ stands for स^1 , but which in no instance will suit the employment of $\langle \text{𐎶} \rangle$ $\langle \text{𐎶} \text{𐎶} \rangle$. An argument in favour of a Sanskrit etymology, is that *hagha* is employed in Pushtú², in exact analogy with the Cuneiform *hauva*, to express indifferently the personal pronoun and the demonstrative; but the coincidence in this case may be accidental, for I do not believe any connecting link is to be traced in Zend, or in a single other living dialect of the Persian family.

But while I thus compare the Cuneiform *hauva* immediately with the Hebrew הוּא , Syriac ܗܘܐ , and Arabic هو , I am not prepared to say that the initial aspirate may not be in its origin cognate with the Sanskrit ह ; and Gesenius notes a number of Teutonic forms of the 3rd person, *ho, hu, huc, hua, &c.*³, which have a striking resemblance to the Semitic pronoun, but in which the aspirate must have sprung from ह , while in its primitive sibilant shape, and with its primitive demonstrative power equally applicable to relatives and to the 2nd and 3rd persons, the pronominal root *sa* is not only to be traced extensively in the Arian and Semitic languages, but it has even penetrated into the Scythian family⁴.

Hauva may be indifferently translated in the inscriptions by

¹ As in the terms '*uvāmarshiyush*, '*Uvakhshatara*, and '*uvāip(a)shayam*.

² *Hagha*, indeed, must it would seem be derived from *sasva* through the Zend 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 , *hakha*, a term which I do not remember to have met with in the Zend writings, but which may have very well existed in the language.

³ See Heb. Lex. (Eng. Edit.) p. 269, with the references to Fulda and Schmittheuner; the Greek δ is of course cognate.

⁴ Compare Semitic Heb. הוּא , and Babylonian *sha* or *asha*, "who;" Arian, Sans. सः , सा , "he," "she," and the characteristic of the 2nd person in verbs; Goth. *sa*, *so*, "that;" Germ. *sie*, *so*; Eng. *she*; Arm. *sa*, "this;" Esthon. *sa*, "thou;" Gr. *συ*; Irish, *so*, "that;" *se*, "he;" *sidh*, "you;" *siad*, "they," &c. and Scythic, Turk. *sen*, Finnish *sina*, "thou," &c. Gesenius, in an excellent note to the Heb. הוּא (Lex., Eng. Ed. p. 111), maintains the primitive demonstrative to be a dental, which passing through *th* becomes a sibilant.

"he," "she," or "that." I conceive its proper signification to be demonstrative, but that it was substituted for the personal pronoun¹ to fill up a blank in the language.

The neuter *ava*^a which answers both to the nom. and accusative of the singular number, is sometimes also found in composition. We have thus *avataiya*, "id tibi," (Col. IV., l. 76, p. 254, and l. 79, p. 256), and *avashchiya*, "id-ce," (Ins. No. 15, l. 20, p. 330, and No. 17, l. 14, p. 337.) Under the head *Aniyashchiya*, I have endeavoured to explain the rule under which an aspirated sibilant is employed as a neuter characteristic before the indefinite particle. The introduction of the Cuneiform 𐎧 cannot be, I think, a mere euphonic artifice, or we should have had the orthography of *hauvashchiya* instead of *hauvachiya*. A terminal visarga must have originally existed as a neuter inflexion^a,

¹ Since writing the above, I have found a complete explanation of the Cuneiform 𐎧𐎶 𐎧𐎺 𐎧𐎽 in Bopp's Comp. Gr. s. 347. The Sans. base *sa* should form, of course, according to rule, in the nom. sing. masc. *sas*, and we thus actually have the orthography of 𐎧𐎶 before a stop. The case sign *s*, however, (which is lost in the common 𐎧, to avoid, as Bopp says, s. 348, an iteration of the same element, is frequently vocalized to *u*, and 𐎧𐎺, therefore, which occurs before words commencing with *s* is a contraction of *sa+u* for *sau*. To this 𐎧𐎺 exactly answers the Zend 𐬵𐬀, *hâ*, and I cannot doubt, therefore, that *hau* is the true orthography of the Cuneiform pronoun. The euphonic *va* has been added, as a word in the old Persian cannot terminate in *u*, and it has subsequently remained, (with the exception of the solitary example of *haushaiya*) as an integral portion of the pronoun. This does not explain, however, the employment of *hauva* for the feminine, instead of *hâ* for 𐎧𐎶 or 𐎧𐎺, nor does it impugn the connexion I have proposed to establish between the Arian and Semitic correspondents; on the contrary, the Zend *hâ*, and Cuneiform *hau*, (or by extension *hauva*), determinately, as I think, connect the Hebrew 𐤅𐤍, with the Sans. 𐎧, and prove the Semitic to be a secondary and later form, by showing that it owes its termination in *â* to the vocalization of a case-sign *s*, which is peculiar to the nominative of languages of the Arian family. The indifferent employment of *hauva*, moreover, for the masc. and fem. is a remarkable point of coincidence between the early Hebrew and the language of the inscriptions, and would appear to indicate that the Semites had adopted the term from the Persian branch of the Arian stock of languages.

^a With *ava* compare the Greek *av* in *av-θi*, *av-rôs*, &c., and also the Slavonic *ovo*.

^b Bopp observes in his Comp. Gr. s. 231, (Eng. Edit. p. 245,) that "Neuters have in Zend, as in the kindred European languages, a short *a* for their termi-

but, in preference to supposing the sibilant to be elided as the first member of a compound groupe in *tyamaiya*, *tyapatiya*, *avataiya*, &c., I now consider the *s* after *a* to have been lost, as a general rule, in all neuter forms, and to be solely dependent for its reproduction on the prosodial power of the indefinite suffix, which is in fact, the only enclitical particle in the language. *Ava*, as a neuter form, does not appear to exist in Zend; it is replaced by 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *aom*, the pronoun following the declension of the Sanskrit सर्वे.

For the accus. masc. sing. the contraction of the Cuneiform *avam*¹ into the Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *aom*, is perfectly regular; and the same may be said of the substitution of 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *avaḡhé* for *avahyá*, in the gen. masc. In the latter term, the elongation of the suffix is owing to the position of the *a* as a terminal, for where *avahya* occurs in composition, as in *avahyarádiya*, "eâ ratione," (Col. I., lines 6 and 7, p. 196, &c.) the 𐬀𐬀𐬀 is suppressed.

We have no example, I believe, of the nom. masc. plur. in the inscriptions, but it would undoubtedly present the same form of *avaiya*, which we find in the accusative. The Zend declension for these cases follows the adjectival rather than the pronominal form, and we have thus 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *avá*, instead of *avé*². Upon what principle the pronominal declension in the language of the inscriptions adopted the same form for the nom. and accus. masc. plur., I have not yet been able to ascertain³. Such, however, is

nation, perhaps the remains of the full *as*." The existence of this *s*, however, can, I believe, hardly be traced in Zend or Sanskrit, and the Cuneiform terms therefore, *avashchiya* and *aniyashchiya* are the more valuable. It is singular, however, that where the neuter *s* does occur in Sans. in *adas*, Bopp considers it to be a weakened form of *t*. See Comp. Gr., s. 350.

¹ *Avamsham*, which frequently occurs in the inscriptions, is the accus. masc. sing. of the demonstrative pronoun in composition with the genitive plural suffix of the 3rd person.

² The Zend *avá* (instead of *aváo*) however, for the nom. and accus. masc. plur. of the demonstrative pronoun requires explanation. According to Bopp, (see Comp. Gram., s. 239, and note to s. 231), they must be, I think, neuter forms substituted for the masculine. Burnouf (*Yaçna*, Notes, &c., p. ix.) engages to discuss them at some future time.

³ Bopp (Comp. Gram., note to s. 228,) observes, that "In Zend the pronominal form in *é* occurs for the most part in the accus. plur.;" but I do not find the reason of this marked disagreement with the Sanskrit.

undoubtedly the case, for we have not only two examples of *avaiya* in the accusative, but in composition we have also *imai* and *tyai* in the same grammatical condition.

The fem. plur. *avá* may be either of the nom. or accus. case, corresponding with a term which would be in Sanskrit *avás*, and in Zend *aváo*. It is formed with perfect regularity, but the neuter plural *avá*, which presents the same orthography, is not so easily disposed of. That the letter 𐬨 represents the characteristic of the plur. neut. accus., (and I conclude of the nom. also) is certain, for although the employment of *avá* in the sixteenth and seventeenth paragraphs of the fourth column at Behistun, is not sufficiently defined to determine a grammatical rule, there is at any rate no doubt whatever attaching to the phrase *atara imá hamar(a)ná*, "in these battles." Now in Zend, the neuter plural characteristic is a short *a*, in Sanskrit it is *áni*, and with neither of these forms, therefore, can the Cuneiform 𐬨 be immediately compared¹. In Zend, however, when a neuter plural form is attached to an enclitical particle, the *a* is lengthened (as in *vispá-cha*, "omniaque,") showing that the original characteristic was the same as in the language of the inscriptions; and perhaps also in the Vedic *विष्वा visva*, "omnia," we may recognize an identical inflexion, rather than a contraction of *visváni*². I have conjectured in a former place that the characteristic neuter sibilant, which certainly belonged to the singular, may also in the primitive state of the language of the inscriptions have been appended to the plural, *avá*, which in Zend is shortened to *ava*, being originally *avás*, but the verification of this obscure point must depend upon our meeting with the possible forms *avashchiya*, *imáshchiya*, &c., where neuter plurals may be attached to the indefinite particle.

The gen. masc. plur. *avaishám*, (Zend 𐬡𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀 *avaéshām*, is independent of comment³, and it only remains therefore, that

¹ For an excellent examination of the plural neuter in Zend, see Bopp's Comp. Gr., note to s. 231.

² Bopp, however, in the note to s. 234 of his Comp. Gr., decides differently.

³ Bopp considers the pronominal ending in *sám*, (which becomes after an *i* *shám*, and which in nouns is contracted to *ám*) to be the original, and formerly the universal form of the case-suffix of the gen. plur. of the Sanskrit; and he compares with it the Goth. *xé* or *xo*; Germ. *ro*; Latin *rum*; and the Gr. endings in *ων* and *ων* for *αων* and *εων*. (See Comp. Gr. s. 248, and the foot-note to the same).

I should consider *abish*. In my notes to the passage where this term occurs, p. 212., I have conjectured that it may possibly be an erroneous orthography for *avabish*, the context appearing to require the signification of "illis," rather than "his." The emendation is, however, to say the least of it, somewhat hazardous, and if *abish* be the true reading, the term must be referred to the pronominal root *a*, which in Sanskrit, in Zend, and in the language of the inscriptions furnishes a number of inflexions for the immediate¹, but none for the remote demonstrative. I shall accordingly examine *abish* under the head *Iyam*.

I have now to make some observations on the suffixes of the 3rd person. These terms are of the most common employment in the inscriptions, and to a certain extent they have been preserved in the modern Persian, but they are entirely unknown to the Sanskrit, and in Zend and Prakrit, although they exist in the direct pronominal form, they have been lost as suffixes². The base upon which they are formed I consider to be the demonstrative *sa*, which, as I have before observed, is especially employed to represent the pronoun of the 3rd pers. The singular *shaiya* is altogether analogous to *maiya* and *taiya*, being formed from the said base with the suffix in *i*, which probably belongs to the locative, but which gives to the Sans. मे *mé*, ते *té*, &c., a genitive or dative signification; and the correspondent of the plural number, *sham*, which exhibits the genitive inflexion in चाँ or चै, has perhaps itself given rise to the pronominal termination for that case³. From whence however the *i* has been derived in

¹ Compare Sanskrit *asya*, Vedic *ayá*, Zend and Cuneiform *aná*, or Sanskrit *asmat*, &c., &c.

² See Comp. Gr. ss. 55 and 341; से *sé*, in Prakrit, and હે *he*, હો *hói*, and શે *she*, in Zend, are of very frequent employment for the gen. and dat. of the 3rd pers. sing. in all genders. Bopp considers that where we have *shé*, *sháo*, &c., in Zend written with the 𐬥𐬀, the aspiration must be caused by the influence of a preceding *i* or *u*; but in the old Persian the employment of the 𐬥𐬀, which is perhaps the primitive form of the base, is certainly independent of all euphonic rules, and has been continued in the modern language.

³ See Bopp's Comp. Gr., s. 248. The German philologist was not aware of the existence of the suffix for the gen. plur. of the 3rd pers. or he would probably have compared it with the pronominal ending in चाँ *shám*.

the accusative masculines I cannot conceive. We meet with *shim* very frequently for the accus. masc. both of the singular and plural number, and in one instance, I think, also in the plural we have the orthography of *shish*¹. Now the *m* is the regular accus. suffix for the singular, and it may be supposed also to be allied to the plural *n*; or if Bopp be right in considering the true plural accus. ending to be *ns*², we may suppose that in the Cuneiform suffixes the nasal has been preserved in one form, and the sibilant, aspirated by the power of the *i*, in the other; but the origin and grammatical power of this *i*, in *shim* and *shish*, still remain altogether obscure to me³. I fear also that our means are insufficient for substantiating the existence of the neuter plur. accus. suffix in *dish* or *adih*. The only examples that occur are *tyādish*, (Col. I., l. 65,) and *niyadish*, (Col. IV., lines 73 and 78⁴); and the sense is in each passage too obscure to admit of our identifying with any precision the grammatical condition of the suffix. Under these circumstances, I will merely suggest, that in *dish* we have appended to the demonstrative base the Sanskrit neuter characteristic in *i*⁵, followed by the sibilant, which, although elided after *a*, certainly belongs in the language of the inscriptions to that gender in the singular, and which may be here retained in the plural in an aspirated form by its affinity for the preceding vowel⁶.

There can be no doubt but that the pronominal sibilant base which has produced the Cuneiform demonstrative suffixes, has

¹ Beh., Col. III., l. 52, p. 234.

² See Comp. Gr., ss. 236 and 239.

³ *Shim* and *shām* are certainly used for the fem. as well as the masc., but I do not think we have any example of the double employment of *shiya*; *shish* is a doubtful word.

⁴ See the notes to these passages in Chap. IV.

⁵ As in the regular plural ending in *anī*, where the *n* is simply euphonic. See Comp. Gr., sect. 234.

⁶ There is I find in Zend a pronoun of this exact form, 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎 *dīs* or *dish*, which is supposed to be the instrum. plur. of *dī*, being contracted from 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 *dibīs*. I doubt if the Cuneiform 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 can represent the instrumental case, but it may well be referred to the same demonstrative base *dī*, (connected according to Bopp with *ta*), which has produced in Zend *dish* or *dīs* in the plur., and the accus. 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎 *dim*, "him," in the singular. See Comp. Gr. foot-note to s. 219, and the reference which is there given to Burnouf's Paper in the Nouv. Journ. Asiatique.

suffix (अ) has left few traces of थ; were it not indeed for इह *ihā*, "here," and सह *sahā*, "with," which must have been originally *idhā* and *sadhā*, (the latter form actually occurring in the Vedas, and the Cuneiform correspondents being *idā* and *hadā*), we should hardly be able to recognize the true suffix of place. In Zend, however, the field of comparison is much more extensive; we have *hadhā*, *adhā*, *idhā*, and *tadhā*, and also 𐬡𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀, the exact correspondent of the Cuneiform *avadā*¹; while in regard to the Greek, Bopp compares *ἐνθα* and *ἐνθαῦθα*², and remarks that in the *αῦθα* of the latter word, we have a form positively identical with the Zend *avadhā*. Where *avadā* is employed in combination with a pronominal suffix, (compare *avadashim* and *avadashish*?) the elongation of the final vowel is not unfrequently suppressed, which brings the Cuneiform adverb into more close analogy with its correspondents in the kindred languages; but there is at the same time a very remarkable liability to inflexion appertaining to the word in the inscriptions, which will hardly, I think, admit of illustration from any foreign source. To express the sense "from there" or "from that place," we have the Cuneiform terms *hachā avadasha*, where an ablative inflexion is evidently appended to the locative suffix. The hypothesis of Bopp, founded upon Zend analogy, that the ablative sibilant of the Sanskrit is throughout a secondary form, resting on an exchange with a primitive *t*³, is not I believe generally admitted. At any rate we have the case-sign of *s* in the Cuneiform ablative *hachā Bābiraush*, "from Babylon;" and it must therefore be of considerable antiquity. But even supposing that the ablative inflexion appended to the locative suffix in *avadasha* be of kindred origin with the Sans. ablative *s*, I am still unable to explain upon what principle it can have undergone aspiration; or, indeed, to conjecture whether the primitive form of the inflexion may have been *shat*, *shas*, or *shan*. This question, then, I gladly leave to the consideration of better scholars⁴.

¹ See Burnouf's *Yaçna*, *loc. cit.*

² See *Comp. Gram.*, (Eng. Ed.) p. 387, and also s. 420 of vol. II., p. 589.

³ See *Comp. Gram.*, (Eng. Ed.) p. 202, in the note to s. 183.

⁴ Perhaps the termination in *ava-dasha* is after all nothing more than a modification of the Sans. तस्, with which is allied the Latin *tus* in *caelitus*, and *tur* in *igitur*. At any rate the old Germ. *yú-dúshe*, "from whence," has the same abla-

𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀮 AVAPARÁ, [Col. III., l. 72, p. 237,] *Ultra eum locum*. I have some doubts of the orthography of this word, and will merely suggest, therefore, that it may be an adverb formed from the demonstrative *ava* with a suffix identical in all respects with the Sanskrit particle *अवा*. It is certainly startling to find a preposition used as an adverbial suffix, but the construction of the sentence in which the word occurs, prevents my offering any other possible explanation¹.

𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀮 AVAHANAM, [Col. II., l. 33, p. 218,] *Vicus*. This is a neuter noun formed from the root *वस*, "to dwell," with the suffix in *अन*. (see Wilkins, s. 824, p. 471.) The quantity of the initial vowel cannot be determined, for in Sanskrit we have the corresponding forms of *अवसथः* and *आवसथः*, which are only distinguished from the Cuneiform term in the employment of a different suffix. If the 𑀮 be short we must consider it as an unmeaning prosthesis²; otherwise it may be identified with the particle *आह*. The neuter termination in *anam* is of very common employment in the inscriptions, (compare *vardanam*, "a city;" *hamaranam*, "battle;" *stānam*, "a place;") and is added to roots to form nouns expressive of substantive action, precisely in the same manner as in Sanskrit.

𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀮 𑀭𑀮 𑀮 AVÁJA-A, [Col. I., l. 31, p. 200, &c.,] *Occidit*.

AVAJ-ANAM, [Col. I., l. 57, p. 204, &c.,] *Occidi*.

These terms are of very common employment; they are formed

tive affix, and that term is compared by Bopp with the Sanskrit *यतस् yatas*. See Comp. Gr. s. 421.

¹ In my notes to col. 3, par. 11, at Behistun, I have shown the impossibility of regarding *ava* as a pronoun united to a postposition, for in that case the antecedent would be feminine, and the *a* in *ava* would be elongated.

² The prosthetic *a*, so common in Zend and Persian, is not acknowledged in Sanskrit, yet I cannot otherwise explain the orthography of *avasathas*, for the etymology of the grammarians given by Wilson, (Diet. p. 81,) is evidently forced. In the inscriptions also, although the employment of the prosthesis is certainly very rare, it would be hazardous to say it were unknown.

from the root *jan*, “to strike, (Sans. हन्¹), with the prefixed particle *ava*, (Sans. अवः,) and they have a grammatical value in showing that the language of the inscriptions coincided with the Sanskrit, in adding the personal endings in the second conjugation immediately to the root. The true form of the 3rd pers. sing. act. imperf. of हन् would be अवहन् which is contracted to अवहन्, as a terminal compound letter is inadmissible in Sanskrit. In the ancient Persian in the same way *jan* would produce *ajant*, which by the lapse of the nasal before a dental would become *aiat*, and by the elision of the final silent letter *aja*. *Ajanam*, as the 1st person sing. of the act. imp. answers exactly to अवहन्, the *n* of the root being preserved when it no longer falls upon a dental. I may add, that *avāja* and *avājanam* are for *ava + aja* and *ava + ajanam*, the temporal augment coalescing with the vowel of the particle, and becoming in consequence elongated. Where the root *jan* is used alone it signifies generally “to smite” or “defeat,” as in Sanskrit. In composition with the particle *ava*, the meaning is restricted to “killing.” For further remarks upon the verbal root, see under the head *Jan*.

ॐ > ३ ॐ > १< =< ॥ १<- ॐ AVĀJANİYÁ, [Col. I., lines
51 and 52, p. 204.] *Declarabat.* The etymology of this term is
very uncertain. From the context of the passages where it
occurs, it can only signify “declaring” or “proclaiming,” and it
would appear moreover to be the 3rd pers. sing. of a past tense;
but on the other hand, the elongation of the terminal vowel will
not suit any form of the Sanskrit imperfect, perfect, or aorist.
With much hesitation, then, I propose to explain *avājanīyá*, as
the 3rd pers. sing. of the potential mood of the ninth conjugation*,
the verb from which it is derived being the causal form of वह,
“to bear,” preceded by the particle आङ्. The Sans. आवाहनं
“calling,” and the Persian آواز, “voice,” explain the manner
in which the sense may have been modified from “bearing” to

¹ This root in Zend becomes *𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀 jan* or *𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀 san*, and in modern Persian *𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀 san*.

² In this view *ávájaniyá* will stand for *ávájaniyát*.

the fourth letter being <X>; and I translate it accordingly "in succession" or "imitation." Until the orthography, however, be definitively restored it is useless to examine it at any length.

五 五 五 五 五

ASAGART-A, [Ins. No. 4, l. 15, p. 280,] *Sagartia*.

ASAGART-AM, [Col. IV., l. 23, p. 241,] *Sagartiam*.

ASAGART-AIYA, [Col. II., line 80, 81, p. 226,] *Sagartiā* (for *Sagartiæ*).

ASAGART-IYA, [Col. IV., line 20, 21, p. 241,] *Sagarticus*.

The country of *Asagarta* appears in the inscriptions to have been situated between Media and Parthia, but to have been included within the political limits of the former province; I judge of its situation from observing that it heads the list of "Eastern," Satrapies¹, (of which the western boundaries must have been the Caspian Straights), the names of *Asagarta*, *Parthwa*, and *Zaraka* being given in succession, and evidently in geographical order; while its political dependence can be proved by the omission of the name in three out of four of the lists of the Satrapies; by the fact of the rebel *Chiratakhma*, who threw Sagartia into revolt, claiming to be of the Median family of Cyaxares; and particularly by the employment of an expression in the fifteenth paragraph of the second column at Behistun, "This is what was done by me in Media," in reference to the reduction of Sagartia, as well as to the defeat of the Median pretender Phraortes.

The name of *Asagarta* suggests many important considerations. M. Jacquet, (*Journal Asiatique* for October, 1838, p. 407,) by a somewhat forced etymology, translates the title by "the great river," and supposes the tribe accordingly to which it appertained to have dwelt on the banks of the Oxus. *Garta*, however, is probably the same territorial suffix which occurs in the Sanskrit **त्रिगर्त**, and the original ethnic form therefore will

¹ See Ins. No. 4, l. 15. I continue to read "*dahyáva tyá parauiya*," the Eastern provinces," *parauiya* being for पूर्व, the locat. sing. of पूर्व, "the East."

* Lassen (Pentapot., p. 32,) and Troyer (Raj. Tar., tom. I. p. 501,) are content to derive the affix in *Trigarta*, (which is still the family name of the Râjas of *Jallandhar*), from गार्गि, "a cavern;" but such an etymology seems to be anything but satisfactory. I shall examine the term in detail, under the head *Varadnam*.

be *Asa*. Now without enquiring whether these *Asa* may have been connected with the *Aswas* (अश्वः) or *Ἀσσοι*, whose subsequent conquests were so renowned in history¹, it is at any rate worthy of remark, that the Scandinavian nations, whose Eastern origin is unquestionable, retained in their mythology the name of *Asgard*², and regarded the happy region which was thus designated with much the same veneration that the Hindus paid to the fabulous *Meru*, or the early Persians to *Airyanām Vairjo*. It may be presumed then, I think, that the Scandinavian races either sprang from the country of *Asagarta*, or that the tribe of that name in its original emigration with the other Arian colonists to the westward, threw off a branch which first settled on the Euxine, and subsequently penetrated to the north of Europe³.

Of the Persian *Asagarta* or *Sagartii* our knowledge is very limited. By Herodotus, they are classed with the Sarangians, the Thamanians, the Utians, and the Mecians⁴, and the Satrapy thus composed would appear to have encircled the great salt desert of Persia to the eastward. They are in another passage described by the same author as a nation of Persian descent, speaking the Persian language, forming in their dress a connecting link between the Persians and Pactyans, and serving with the Persian cavalry in the army of Xerxes⁵. In Justin, also,

¹ The *Aswas*, of Indian romance, were one of the great divisions of the *Yadava* race. They are first known in classical history as the invaders of Bactria, (Strab. XI., p. 511,) and may be subsequently traced for a long period in Chinese annals as the dominant race in Persian Khorasan. (See Foë Koué Ki, p. 83; Nouv. Mélanges Asiat., tom. I., p. 217; and De Guignes' foot-note to p. 51, tom. I., Part 2^{me} of the Hist. des Huns.)

² The first immigration of the Asi into the north of Europe is lost in antiquity, but Odin brought in the second colony from *Asgard*, about the Christian era. The subject has been thoroughly examined by Geijer, in his *Schwedens Urgeschichte*.

³ Odin was popularly believed to have brought the Asi from the Euxine.

⁴ Lib. III., c. 93; the *Σαράρυαι* are of course the inhabitants of *Zaranj*, زرنج, of whom more hereafter. In the *Θαράρυαι*, I recognize the tribe which gave its name to *دماغان* *Damaghán*, *دماوند* *Damawend*, &c. The *Οἱριοι* may, perhaps, be identified with the *Futiyá* of the Inscriptions, and the *Méroi* colonized *مكران* *Mekrán*.

⁵ Lib. VII., c. 85; the Pactyans are a disputed race, but may, I think, be compared with the Zend *بادغی* *Baghdhi*, which by common consent is identified with Bactria.

there is a remarkable notice of them. "The Parthians," he says, "were Scythian exiles, driven out of their country by domestic wars; they occupied the deserts between Hyrcania, the Dahi, the Arii, the *Sagartians*, and the Margians¹." Ptolemy further places them in Media to the north of Choromithrene, and in the eastern parts of the range of Zagros². From all this I infer, that forming a part of the Arian immigration which is figured in Persian romance as the conquest of *Feridûn*, they established themselves particularly along the mountain range to the south of the Caspian, this in fact being the extreme western point which the colonists had reached at the time of the composition of the first *Fargard* of the *Vendidad*, and the locality being moreover especially connected with all those antique traditions which commemorated the advent of the race into Persia, and their suppression both of Scythian and of Semitic power. When the great mass of colonists moved to the South, and spread themselves over the plains of Persis, raising a native dynasty to the throne, which first acquired celebrity under its third member, Achæmenes, I further believe the *Sagartians* and *Thamanians* to have remained in their seats along the Caspian mountains; and although from their position, politically subservient to the Medes, and separated by the great salt desert from their brethren in Persis, to have still retained, at any rate as late as the age of Herodotus and probably much later, a close connexion with the true Perso-Arian stock³.

I shall have occasion to revert to this subject in the historical chapter, and will only therefore at present add, that we may probably trace an early position of the *Asa* in the *Asapuragân*, on the north-western skirts of Paropamisus⁴, while I have no doubt but that to the same race is to be attributed the very remark-

¹ Lib. XLI., c. 1; in all editions of Justin that I have consulted, the name is written *Spartani*, but this must be an error for *Sagartani*.

² Lib. VI., c. 2; Ptolemy's Geography of Media is very loose; he appears to join Zagros, Orontes, Jasonium (*Damavand*), and Coronus in a continuous chain, and where he mentions Zagros in allusion to the *Sagartii*, I understand him to speak of that part of the range about the Caspian Gates. In his *Χωρομειρήνη* I recognize خوار *Khâr*, although he names the same district in his account of Parthia, *Χοροάνη*.

³ The ethnography of Persia will be examined in detail hereafter.

⁴ In the old authors اسپورگان, now called *Shibbergân*.

able fort of *Lasgird*¹, which is situated in the very heart of their permanent seats between Parthia and Media.

𐭠 𐭡𐭣 𐭡𐭣 𐭠 𐭡𐭣 ASTIYA. See AMIYA.

𐭠 𐭡𐭣 𐭡𐭣 𐭠 𐭡𐭣 𐭠 𐭡𐭣 ASBÁRA-IBISH, [Col. II., l. 2, p. 214,] *Equitibus*. The word *asbára* shows how little in some instances the Persian language has changed since the time of Cyrus, for in the modern dialect اسوار *Aswár*, or سوار *Sowár*, nearly reproduces the Cuneiform term. It is derived from the Sanskrit अश्वः, "a horse," which became اسف in Zend, and اسپ *asp* in Persian; the Cuneiform sonant labial which was preserved in Pehlevi *asobár*, "a horseman," and in the Armenian *sbára-bied*, "a master of horse," occupying a middle place between the Devanagari अ, and the Zend اس. The Greek ἵππος, and Latin *equus*, are also cognate terms, for the interchange of gutturals and labials is an acknowledged law of orthography. That the plural case-endings of the instrumental and of the dative-ablative, which take the different form of 𐭠𐭡 and 𐭠𐭡 in Sanskrit, and of 𐭠𐭡 and 𐭠𐭡 in Zend, must have been in their origin identical, has always been admitted, and the assimilation is confirmed by their being found in the inscriptions to be represented indifferently by the orthography of 𐭡𐭣 𐭠 𐭡𐭣; but there has been much disagreement as to the explanation of the

¹ لاسگرد, the initial letter is the Pehlevi article. The construction of this fort, which is near the town of *Semnán*, bears evident marks of the very highest antiquity.

* Compare also the Georgian *Spár-sálár*, a general of cavalry, and see an excellent note on the word in St. Martin's *Armenia*, tom. I., p. 298. I have already alluded to the *Aswas* of Indian history, one of the great Scythic tribes which held the country between the Oxus and the Indus; but I have not explained the subsequent mutations of the name, which are however full of interest; for according to the Pali rule of simplifying compound groupes, we have on the one hand *Assá-can*, the Greek Ἀσσηκάνοι, and on the other the *Appa-goni* of Pliny, whence the modern افغان *Afghan*, the termination in both cases being, as I think, a Scythic plural suffix, which was adopted from the same source into the Chaldee and Pehlevi.

vowel which is used to connect the termination with the theme, and in this view the Cuneiform examples are of interest¹. In the instrumental plural of themes in *a*, the old Persian always employs an epenthetic *i* before the case-ending, and we have thus *asbá-raibish*, *martiyaibish*, *kamanaibish*, *Bagaibish*, *vith(a)ibish*, &c., but in the dative-ablatives *abish*, *vithabish*, and *ruchabish*, the supernumerary vowel is omitted; and that this difference is intended to mark a distinction of case, instead of being attributable to the respective endings of the theme in short *a*, and in a silent letter, is placed beyond dispute, I think, by the double form of *vith(a)ibish* and *vithabish*, proceeding from the same theme *vith*. I shall recur to this subject hereafter, and will merely therefore at present, compare the ending of *asbáraibish* with that of the Vedic अश्वभिः *aswébhis*.

𐎠𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 ASMÁNAM, [passim,] *Colum*. This is the accusative singular of a masc. theme in silent *n*, derived from אָשַׁן, "to spread," with a suffix of attribution, (see Wilkins, s. 801,) and declined like the Sans. अश्वन्. The corresponding accusative form in Zend is 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *açmanəm*, and in Persian اسمان *asmán*. Undoubtedly also the Vedic अश्वन्, "a cloud," is a cognate derivative; but it is not merely in the Arian languages that we find this term; it is also employed extensively throughout the Semitic family, and even in Etruscan and Celtic, every where no doubt signifying "the expanse of the firmament; that which is spread out;" in exact analogy with the Hebrew רָקִיעַ from רָקַע. Compare *saman* in Phœnician, Etruscan, and Irish; שָׁמַיִם in Hebrew; ሥማይ in Æthiopic; سماء in Arabic*, &c., the only question being, I think, whether the final nasals may be plural terminations, or whether, as the initial sibilant alone con-

¹ Professor Bopp has elaborately examined this subject in his *Comp. Gram.* ss. 215—225, and Burnouf's Remarks on the Origin and Use of the Vowel Modifications in Zend which precede the case-endings, may be seen in his *Commentaire sur le Yaçna*, p. 177.

* See Gesen. Lex., p. 1026, Eng. Edit.: Gesenius, however, pretends to derive שָׁמַיִם from an obsolete root שָׁמַח, "to be high."

stitutes the root, they may not rather be relics of the Sanskrit affix of attribution.

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩 ASHANIYA, [Col. II., line 11, 12, p. 215,] *Profiscens*? Occurring in a single mutilated passage, I can only render this word conjecturally, as the present participle of a verb corresponding with the Sanskrit अश्, "to go" or "move." That the language of the inscriptions formed its present participle by adding *aniya* instead of *an* to the root is tolerably certain; for *chartaniya*, which is met with in almost every paragraph at Behistun, will alone admit of that grammatical explanation; and the same participial termination is also probably to be recognized in *thastaniya* and *vataniya*; but I must confess at the same time, that I have sought in vain for any corroborative evidence in Zend or Sanskrit, and that it is moreover sufficiently remarkable, if *aniya* be in reality the case-ending of the nom. of the present participle, to find that it undergoes no modification in the plural. I shall refer to this subject again hereafter¹.

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩 AITA, [Col. I., lines 44 and 45, p. 203, &c.,] *Id.* This is the nom. neuter of the compound demonstrative pronoun, which is एतद् in Sanskrit, and *aetat* in Zend, being formed by a fusion of three bases, *a*, *i*, and *ta*². A question arises whether the Cuneiform *aita* may stand for *aitat*, (Sans. *etat*), or for *aitas*, the sibilant being, as I think, the true neuter characteristic, as in *avash-chiya* and *aniyash-chiya*. In the restored compound term *aitamaiya*, "id mihi," (Insc. No. 3, l. 22, 23, and No. 6, l. 54, 55,) I would rather suppose a contraction for *aitasmaiya* than for *aitatmaiya*, for there is no sufficient proof that the dental would lapse before the *m*; but as the restoration is in both passages doubtful, I cannot pretend to deliver any certain opinion³.

¹ See under the heads *Chartaniya* and *Thastaniya*, where I have given a conjectural explanation of the ending in *aniya*, and supposed it to represent a gerund of present time, rather than a true present participle.

² For an analysis of this pronoun, see Bopp's Comp. Gram., s. 369, Eng. Edit., vol. II., p. 518. Bopp appears to consider *e* in एतः, एतद्, एव, एवं, &c., as a distinct pronominal base.

³ *Aitamaiya* is no doubt formed on the same principle as *avataiya*, *tyamaiya*, &c.; the neuter characteristic having been once lost, cannot be reproduced except by the enclitical power of the particle *chiya*.

adopting a suggestion of Burnouf which refers the term to *𐬀𐬎𐬎* *asu*, "life," with an affix of attribution, and translates it by "the living one." *Mazdá*, also, which is used in Zend as a proper name, as in *Mazda-yaçna*, *Mazda-dáta*, &c., is certainly composed of *maz*, "great," (Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬎*; Sans. महत्) and a verbal suffix which may signify "giving," "creating," or "knowing," according as we compare it with *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬎*, *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬎*, or the Greek *δα*¹. Of this double epithet, then, "eternal," and (perhaps) "omniscient," was formed the proper name of the deity supposed to preside over the *Bhagas* or "gods" of the primitive Persian faith. It would be inconvenient in this place to discuss the question of the religious tenets of the Persians in the time of Darius Hystaspes, but I cannot avoid noting that there is no evidence whatever in the inscriptions of the principle of dualism having been acknowledged at the time of their execution, and that upon a single mutilated passage, moreover, (Col. IV., par. 4^a) depends the possibility of our recognizing even a Supreme Being, (*Zerwan* or "Time without bounds,") from which, according to the later Zoroastrian doctrines, *Ormazd* and *Ahrimán* had their common origin. From the usual tenor of the vows and thanksgivings of Darius, we should infer that a class of *Bhagas* or "superior intelligences" were alone supposed to exercise a divine influence upon worldly matters, and that Ormazd, as the chief of these *Bhagas*, was the object of special, if not exclusive, adoration². It is further particularly interesting to find that Ormazd is designated in the Median translation of a part of the Behistun Inscription,

¹ Burnouf prefers the latter derivation, and compares *δα* with the Pers. *دان* *dáná*, "wise," *دانستن* *dánistan*, "to know." He also shows that the Zend *𐬢𐬀𐬎𐬎* *dáo*, "knowledge," *𐬢𐬀𐬎𐬎* *dámi*, "wise," the Sans. *दासुः* *dásus*, "a sage," and the Gr. *δά-ημι*, *δι-δά-σκω*, &c., are probably derivatives from the same root: *dá*, which, with the sense of "knowing," however, has been lost to the Sanskrit. See hereafter under the head *adáná*.

² There would appear from this passage to have been some distinct source, different from Ormazd, from whence "*lies*" *darauga*, were supposed to have had their origin; but it can hardly have been the spirit of evil, for it was friendly to Darius. The name which commences with *Di* - - is unfortunately mutilated.

³ I may add, that to the early Greeks, Herodotus, Xenophon, &c., Persian dualism was evidently unknown. Ormazd is the *Zeús* or *Zeús μέγιστος* of those authors, who was the prime object of worship.

as "the god of *Ariyanam*" or "of the Arians," in evident contradistinction to the deities of the Scyths and Semites¹.

The Greeks, as it is well known, adopted various orthographies for the name, Ὀρομάξης, Ὀρομάσθης, Ὀρομάρης, Ὀρμιόδας, Ὀρμιόδοτος, &c., &c. The Zend retained the primitive form of

𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀 *Ahura Mazdāo*, and the Parthian only differed in the aspiration of the final dental². In the lapidary Pehlevi the aspiration was displaced and the name was written

𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀 *Auramazdō*³. In Pazend we have ھورمزد

Hurmazd; in Persian اورمزد *Ormazd*; in Moghol *Khurmuzda*;

and in Armenian *Aramasd*. I must add, that in the 𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀 *Anhuma* of the Pehlevi books, we have a very ancient term signifying "God" prefixed to the name, and that this prefix *An* or *Ana* was employed as early as the time of the Median and Babylonian translation of the Persian Inscriptions before the name of *Ormazd*.

Professor Lassen has been content to compare the term *Auramazdā* with that limited but anomalous class of nouns in Sanskrit which are derived from monosyllabic roots in long *ā*, but he has certainly failed to show that any possible modification of the rules which affect the Sanskrit declension can sufficiently account for the Cuneiform genitive in *aha* or *ahā*, and to this subject, accordingly, I must devote a few observations. In Sanskrit, we must remember, that nouns in long *ā* of the above class are declined analogously to those which end in consonants, but with this further peculiarity, that before the case-terminations which

¹ The name of *Ormazd*, does not, I believe, occur in any native Babylonian monument.

² I take the Parthian form 𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀, from the inscription of Nakhah-i-Rustam, copied by Flower, or Chardin, in 1667, when the writing was in a more perfect state of preservation than at the time of Niebuhr's visit.

³ See De Sacy's *Ant. de la Perse*, pp. 107 and 249. I cannot here enter into any detail on the Median and Babylonian alphabetical systems, but I will state that the letter 𐬀 in both languages is a nasal, perhaps approaching the Zend 𐬀; and that with the pronunciation of *añ* or *aña*, it signifies "a God," being, in fact, the same as the Arab. ٱللّٰه *Allāh*.

⁴ See the *Zeitschrift*, p. 511, and the reference which is there given to Colebrooke's *Gram.*, p. 49. Bopp, in his *Comp. Grammar*, hardly notices this declension, but refers to his *Gram. Crit.*, s. 130.

commence with vowels, (dat., ablat., gen., and locat.,) the long *a* is rejected, 𐬀𐬀 forming the nom. in 𐬀𐬀: for *dhá-s*, and the gen. in 𐬀: for *dh-as*. In Zend, again, the long vowel of the theme appears not to have been rejected but shortened; and Burnouf thus explains the genitive 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dáo*, (in *Ahuráhé Mazdáo*), which is expressed orthographically in the same manner as the nom. (in *Ahúra Mazdáo*) to be a contraction of *da-as*¹. Assuming then a still more primitive and regular form of declension for the Cuneiform noun, we may believe that the long vowel was neither rejected nor shortened; but that it was preserved intact, and that the case-endings were added to it. The nom. *dá* and the accus. *dám* will thus stand for *dá-s* and *dá-m*, agreeing with the Sans. 𐬀𐬀: and 𐬀𐬀:; and with the Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dáo*, and 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dám*, while the genitive will require to be formed in *dá-a* for *dá-as*; but where the Cuneiform alphabet has no other means of dividing the short *a* from the vowel which precedes or follows it, and where such a division is absolutely necessary in order to make a grammatical distinction, it introduces a euphonic aspirate, *Dár(a)yava(h)ush* being thus written for *Dár(a)yavaush*, and in the same way *dá(h)a* in *Auramazdá(h)a* unquestionably standing for *dá-a*. I have been the more particular in explaining this employment of the Cuneiform <𐬀𐬀>, as it might otherwise have been mistaken for the true genitival sign, or in the absence of any examples of a Sanskrit gen. in *asa*, in might be conjectured to be a radical letter. I was once even inclined myself to believe that the root *dás*, "to know," might have co-existed with *dá*, (𐬀𐬀𐬀: "a sage," being a derivative), and that *dá* and *dám* might have proceeded from the one root, and *dáha* (for *dásas*) from the other; but the irregularity of supposing a noun to follow two different declensions, and the analogous example of *Dar(a)-yava(h)ush*, has now convinced me that the <𐬀𐬀> is a mere

¹ Burnouf has carefully examined the respective formations of the Zend nom. and gen. in his *Comment sur la Yaçna*, p. 77.

² The *á* is preserved in these terms in Sanskrit, as the case-endings do not commence with vowels, but are the simple consonants *s* and *m*.

euphonic letter, and that it possesses no grammatical or etymological power whatever¹.

We have also the forms *Auramazdāmaiya*² and *Auramazdātaiya*, (the latter being written faultily in one passage *Auramazdātaya*), where the suffixed pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons are added to the nominative. In the one the elision of the sibilant, which is the nominative characteristic, before the *m*, is perfectly regular; but in the other, as the *s* should be orthographically retained between the *á* and a dental, we see a further proof that the sibilant (or its substituted aspirate) having been once rejected after *a*, as a case-ending, either masculine or neuter, is reproduced only before an enclitical particle.

𐎠𐎡𐎹𐎠 AURÁ, [Ins. No. 4, l. 24, p. 282,] *Vita? perennitas?* Relying on the possible explanation of *Aura*, which is given under the preceding head, and which supposes *asura*, applied to Brahma in the Vedas, to denote his attribute of "living for ever," unconnected either in sense or etymology with the *Asuras*, "or evil spirits," I am tempted to translate the abstract noun *Aurá* by "vitality" or "eternity." To arrive, however, at this meaning, we must suppose that the adjective *asura* having been formed by the addition of the attributive suffix in *ra* to *asu*, "life," an abstract sense has been obtained by the agglutination of a second suffix in *a*, the theme in long *á*, which has been thus elicited by the fusion of the suffixes, being a fem. noun of the first declension. In my notes to Ins. No. 4, I have brought forward other reasons in favour of this conjectural reading, but I do not pretend to consider it entitled to any exclusive preference.

𐎠𐎡𐎹𐎠𐎹𐎠𐎹𐎠𐎹 AUTIYÁRA, [Col. II., line 58, 59, p. 222,] *Otiara*. This would appear from the inscriptions to have been the name of a district of Armenia, conterminous with Assyria, and I am thus led to suspect that the *Tiyári* Kurds who

¹ The terminal elongation in *Auramazdáhá* is peculiar to Persepolis, and is evidently a corrupted form of the true case-ending. *Dá-as*, in fact, must have become *dá(h)a* before it could be lengthened to *dáhá*, for the principle of elongation depends upon the *a* being a terminal letter.

² Lassen supposes an anomalous dative in *Auramazdāiya*, but that term is certainly an error of the engraver for *Auramazdāmaiya*. It occurs in Ins. No. 6, l. 50, p. 308.

inhabit the mountains in that quarter may preserve a remnant of the title. I derive no assistance, however, from the ancient geographers in identifying the name.

𑀓 i.

𑀓 𑀓 𑀓 Idá, [Col. I., l. 29, p. 200, and Ins. No. 14, l. 24, p. 327,] *Hic*. Adverb of place, formed from the demonstrative base *i* with the suffix in *dá*. Compare the Sans. इह *iha*, Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *idha*, Pali *idha*, &c., and see the remarks on this suffix of place given under the head *Avadá*¹. Where the Cuneiform 𑀓 or 𑀓𑀓 *d*, answers to the Devanagari ह *h*, the Persian form may usually be considered more ancient than the Sanskrit. In the adverbial suffixes particularly, and in the termination of the 2nd pers. sing. of the imper., the Sanskrit aspirate is notoriously a modern degradation, and the Cuneiform dental must be held to represent the true primitive sound. In the present case we may assume, indeed, as almost certain that the Sanskrit इह was originally इष (as सह, "with," is written in the Vedas सष;) and with the ancient, of course, rather than the corrupted, form must the Cuneiform *idá*, therefore, be compared.

𑀓 𑀓𑀓𑀓 IYAM. The immediate demonstrative pronoun signifying "this." It occurs in the Inscriptions in the following forms:—

SINGULAR.

	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Nom.	<i>Iyam,</i> (Detached Ins. l. 1, p. 261—264.)	<i>Iyam,</i> (Ins. No. 3, l. 6, p. 274.)	<i>Ima,</i> (Passim.)
Accus.	<i>Imam,</i> (Passim.)	<i>Imám,</i> (Passim.)	<i>Ima,</i> (Passim.)
Instrum.	} <i>And,</i>	—	—
Ablat.			
	Insc. No. 4, l. 8, p. 279. Insc. No. 15, l. 14, p. 329.	<i>Ahyáyá,</i> (Passim.)	—

¹ Bopp has thoroughly examined this suffix in his *Comp. Gr.*, vol. I., p. 386,

PLURAL.

	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Nom.	<i>Imaiya</i> , (Col. IV., l. 34, p. 243 and 80, p. 257.)	<i>Imá</i> , (Passim.)	_____
Accus.	<i>Imaiya</i> , (Col. IV., l. 31, p. 243.)	<i>Imá</i> , (Passim.)	<i>Imá</i> , (Col. IV., l. 32, p. 243.)
Dat.	<i>Abish</i> , (Col. I., l. 86, p. 211.)	_____	_____

In the declension of this pronoun three demonstrative bases are employed, *a*, *i*, and the compound *ima*; the language of the inscriptions coinciding in this respect with the Zend and Sanskrit.

In the nom. masc., as we have in Sanskrit and Zend the base *a* joined to the suffix in *am*¹ (*a+am*=𐎠𐎡𐎴, and 𐎠𐎡𐎴 *aém*), so in the old Persian and Pali we have *i+am*=*iyam*. I am not certain if *iyam* occurs in the masc. in the written Pali, but it very frequently represents this gender in the edicts of Asoka, and it is unquestionably the form from which the Persian 𐎠𐎡𐎴 *in* has been contracted.

In the nom. fem. the same base is employed in old Persian, Sanskrit, and Zend; compare *iyam* 𐎠𐎡𐎴, and 𐎠𐎡𐎴, the old Persian however being certainly a more ancient form than the Zend contraction.

In the neuter the Zend and Cuneiform agree in adopting the base *ima*; 𐎠𐎡𐎴 in the one, and *ima* in the other, being substituted for the Sanskrit *idam*. I rather suspect, however, that the Cuneiform *ima* in the neut. nom. and acc. sing. is for *imas* rather

&c., and he has shown the thematic identity of 𐎠𐎡𐎴 *idha*, and 𐎠𐎡𐎴 *iha*, in sect. 373 of the same work.

¹ *Am* is a general termination for pronouns; comp. *aham*, *twam*, *vayam*, *yéyam*, &c.

² Bopp observes, that the *a* base is often phonetically lengthened to *e* in Sans., as in *ebhis*, *ebhyas*, *eshám*, *eshu*, and that *ayam*, therefore, may come immediately from *e+am*. See Comp. Gr., s. 366, vol. II., p. 515.

than *imat*, as *ava* and *aniya* are for *avas* and *anayas*¹; (compare *avash-chiya* and *aniyash-chiya*.)

The accus. sing. corresponds in the three languages, being derived from the compound base *ima*. Compare masc. and fem. *imam*, *imām*; ईमं, ईमां; ईमं *imēm*, ईमं *imām*; and in the neuter the difference only regards the characteristic of gender, the Sans. using *imāni* for *ima+ani*, the Zend *ima-t*, and the old Persian *ima*, probably for *ima-s*.

Anā occurs in the inscriptions in two passages; in one (*hadā anā kārā Pārsā*) it has unquestionably an instrumental signification; in the other, (*aniyashchiya anā Pārsā*) it most probably represents an ablative. Now that the Cuneiform *nā* stands for the Sanskrit *smāt*² is proved beyond dispute by the phrase *hachā aniyānā*, where the Sans. would use अन्यस्मात्, and *anā*, therefore, may be legitimately held as the equivalent of अस्मात् *asmāt*, from the demonstrative base *a*; but it so happens that *ana* is also itself used as a base in Zend and Sanskrit in the declension of this very pronoun *idam*, and that it is in both languages especially employed in the instrumental case; so that, if the language of the inscriptions possessed an independent instrumental and ablative, (as I am now almost persuaded was the case,) *anā* might be supposed to perform a double part, representing the one case as the correspondent to अनेन and ॐन³, and the other as the contraction of अस्मात् or ॐस्मत्.

I have in several passages of the former chapters alluded to the possible identity of the instrumental and ablative in the old Persian, and I have chiefly founded this opinion on the double

¹ According to Bopp, however, as I have before remarked, the true neuter characteristic is *t*, and where the *s* is found in Sanskrit, as in *adas*, it is a weakening of the primitive dental; see Comp. Gr., s. 350.

² A question, however, arises, whether *nā* (for *nāt*) be really a phonetic degradation of *smāt*, or whether the old Persian may not have used for the abl., the pronominal base *na*, (which occurs in the compound base *ana*, and in many inflexions) instead of the appended pronoun *ma*; see Comp. Gr., s. 372. I prefer at the same time the former explanation, for the *s* uniformly lapses before *m*, and the exchange of *n* for *m* pervades the entire structure of the modern language.

³ The *n* of the Sanskrit instrumental is euphonic, and did not exist either in Zend or in old Persian. The Zend *ana*, therefore, cannot be from the base *a*; it is from the compound *ana* (contracted to *an*.) with the instrum. sign, short *a*. See Comp. Gr., s. 158.

signification of *aná*; but if that term, really, as I think probable, represent two distinct grammatical forms, and the coincidence of orthography be accidental, the argument will have to be abandoned; and it will be then most reasonable to explain the Cuneiform $\overline{\text{𐎶}}$ ¹ as the true instrumental characteristic of the singular where it marks the one case², and as the contraction for *át* in the other. We have not in the Inscriptions, I believe, a single determinate plural ablative that can be submitted to comparison³; but as the dative of that number appears to be distinguished from the instrumental, and as in all the cognate languages the case-ending of the dative and ablative plural is the same, the inference of course is that there is a distinction also between the instrumental and the ablative.

In the Cuneiform fem. gen. *ahyáyá* or *ahiyáyá*⁴, we have, I think, a remarkable example of agglutination. The case in question is probably derived, like *aná*, from the demonstrative base *a*, and in the masculine would thus present the form of *ahyá* for 𐎶𐎶𐎶 or 𐎶𐎶𐎶 *ahé*, the final *a* being elongated, as in all other regular genitive terminations. To mark a distinction of gender, then, the fem. suffix in *á*, for *ás*, appears to have been added to the masc. and the euphonic *y* to have been introduced as a mere connecting link, *ahyáyá*, being in fact, the agglutination of *a* + *hyá* + *y* + *ás*. I may add, that in the corresponding form in Sanskrit there is apparently the same double genitival suffix, (but without the connecting *y*.) अस्याः *asyás* being for *a* + *sya* + *as*⁵.

¹ We have numerous instances of the $\overline{\text{𐎶}}$ *á* answering equally to the abl. and instrum. of a theme in *a*. It is, indeed, one of the best defined case-endings of the language.

² See Comp. Gr., s. 158, where Professor Bopp has shown that the real and original case-ending is long *á*, and that the Sans. *n* is a mere euphonic epenthesis.

³ It is highly probable, however, that *rauchabish* is an ablative rather than a dative plural.

⁴ I consider the *i* in *ahiyáyá* to be irregular, and to be introduced for the mere purpose of euphony, before its cognate semi-vowel *y*.

⁵ Perhaps, as the dat., ablat., gen., and locat. of the fem. sing. of this and many other pronouns in Sans. partake in this employment of a suffix in *sya*, interposed between the base and the case-endings, it may be more correct to regard *asya* or *ahya* as a new compound theme derived from the masc. gen. but declined like a regular fem. noun in long *á*; the old Persian following the exact form of the nominat. declension, while the Sans. adds the case-endings immediately to the

In the plural the nom. and acc. are in all the three genders formed from the base *ima*, as in Zend and Sanskrit; but the case-endings exhibit some variety. That the termination in *iya* for *i*, (contracted with the *a* of the base into the diphthong *é* in Zend and Sanskrit) is common to the nom. and acc. plural in the old Persian I have already observed in treating of *avaiya*, and it need not surprise us therefore, that in the Cuneiform masc. we have *imaiya* equally for *इमे* and *इमान्*. I believe, indeed, in Zend, that the termination in *é* is sometimes used indifferently in both cases¹.

The Cuneiform *imá* answers with perfect regularity to the nom. and acc. fem. *इमाः imás*, in Sans.; *𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎴 imáo*, in Zend; and the neuter *imá* which certainly occurs in the accus. (*atara imá hamar(a)ná*), and which may be assumed in the nom. has apparently the same ending which occurs in the Zend *vispácha*, "omnia-que," where the original quantity of the terminal vowel is reproduced before the enclitical particle². The Zend orthography, however, is opposed to the suggestion which I have offered in explaining *avá*, that the neuter sibilant of the singular may also have been retained in the plural; for if that were the case, we should expect to find *vispás-cha* in the accusative, as we actually have in another gender *vispes-cha*³.

The only other plural form that occurs in the inscriptions is

theme *asya*, without employing the connecting *y*. Bopp, relying on the evidence afforded by the fem. instrum. of the Zend, supposes the suffix in *asya* to be throughout a contraction of the fem. appended pronoun *smi*; but neither do the corresponding cases in Zend support this explanation, nor can it possibly account for the Cuneiform genitive *ahyáyá*. See particularly, Comp. Gr., ss. 171 and 172. The Zend correspondent is *𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎴 agháo*.

¹ The usual masc. accusat. plur. of this pronoun in Zend is *𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎴 imá*, which is orthographically equivalent to *इमान्*; but Bopp observes in the foot-note to s. 228 of Comp. Gr., that "In Zend, the pronominal form in *é* occurs for the most part in the accus. plur."

² See the notes of Bopp before quoted, to ss. 231 and 234, Comp. Gr., Eng. Edit., pp. 246 and 250.

³ *Vispescha* occurs in the Vend. Sad. p. 49, and is quoted by Bopp, in a note to s. 228 of the Comp. Gr. It appears to be the accus. masc. plur.; but if so, I do not understand from whence it has obtained the sibilant after the case-ending in *e*.

the masculine dative *abish*¹, and this is in so far, at any rate, a purer form than *इष्यः ebhyas*, or *𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 aēibyo*, that the demonstrative base *a* has been left intact, instead of being modified to *é*. With regard to the case-ending, I must add, that the only dative (or ablative?) plurals which exist in the inscriptions are, *abish*, *vithabish*, and *rauchabish*, and that I doubt therefore, if I have sufficient grounds for declaring positively the (dative-ablative) termination in *bish* or *abish*, to be distinguished from the instrumental in *ibish*, and for seeking to reconcile the former with *bhyas*. In this distinction, however, I am strongly inclined to believe, and I would even suggest, that *bish* (for *bis*, which is preserved entire in *no-bis*, *vo-bis*) is a purer and more ancient form than *bhyas*, the semi-vowel *y* being a development of a primitive *i*².

It only remains to notice the term *imaivá*, where the nom. and acc. plur. occurs in combination with the copulative conjunction, and where the case-ending *i* being no longer final retains its original form, instead of being lengthened into *iya*.

॥ २॥ ISH; root, signifying "to come." I am not quite sure whether the Cuneiform root be *ish*, answering to *इष्*, or *aish*, the equivalent of *एष्*. It is of no great consequence, however, to distinguish the two forms, for they are no doubt of cognate origin, and with the primitive signification of "moving" they equally express in Sanskrit the idea of "going," as the corresponding root in old Persian in its pure state is indicative of "coming." From the immediate root *ish* or *aish*, we have in the inscriptions *aisha* or *disha*, answering indifferently to the 3rd pers. sing. and plural of the active imperfect of the first conjugation, (compare *रेषन्* and *रेषन्*.) and with the initial *a* short or long, according as it may represent the mere temporal augment, or the augment in com-

¹ In the dative-ablatives *vithabish* and *rauchabish*, the themes end in silent consonants, and it is probable, therefore, that the true case-ending in the old Persian is *abish*, which coalescing with the base *a*, may give the reading of *ábish* for the term in question.

² Professor Bopp remarks, that the instrum. termination has in Latin fixed itself in the dative and ablat., (Comp. Gr., s. 216,) and by deducing all the case-endings which commence with *bhy* *भ्य* from the preposition *अभि abhi*, he admits a primitive *i*. Comp. Gr., s. 223.

bination with a radical letter. There is also in a single passage *aishtatá*¹, where, if the duplication of the 𐎠𐎶𐎶 be not an error of the engraver, we must see, I think, the 3rd pers. plur. middle imperf. of a root *isht* substituted for *ish*, as we have in Sans. the optional orthography of *सस्* and *सेस्*, *ज्ञस्* and *ज्ञेस्*². I may observe, however, that *aishtatá* appears to signify "they had come," instead of simply "they came," and that it is just possible therefore there may have been a pluperfect tense in the language of the inscriptions, formed of the past participle and the personal-endings. The termination in *atá* for the Sans. *anta* is perfectly regular, and the elision of the personal-endings as silent terminals in *aisha* has also been sufficiently explained.

There are moreover various derivatives from this root which occur in the inscriptions, and which require to be briefly noticed. We have in the first place *fráish(a)yam*, "I sent," and *fráish(a)ya* (for *fráish(a)yat*³), "he sent," which are the 1st and 3rd persons of the act. imperf. of *ish* in the causal form, and preceded by *fra*, Sans. 𑖔 and Zend 𐎠𐎶𐎶. It is impossible to say in this case, whether the Cuneiform root be *ish* or *aish*, for the term *fráish(a)ya* being in the past tense, the Cuneiform 𐎠𐎶𐎶 may be as well produced by the coalition of the particle with the temporal augment, as by the fusion of three *a*'s in the particle, the augment, and the root. As the Sans. 𑖔𑖑𑖔, "to send," however, is from 𑖔𑖑𑖔, and the Persian فرست *firist*⁴, alone retains the *i*, I prefer the former explanation. The suffix in *aya*, I consider to be the causal characteristic, as in the Sans. 𑖔𑖑𑖔𑖑𑖔, (which is given by Westergaard⁵), the literal meaning of the verb being

¹ Col. I., l. 85.

² See Westergaard's Radices, p. 314. I am the more inclined to believe that *isht* was used indifferently with *ish*, as the modern Persian retains the dental in the root فرست *firist*, "send," which is formed from the same root with the prefixed particle *fra*.

³ I place the *a* in these terms in a parenthesis, as I am not quite sure if the affix be *aya* for the causal form of the verb, or merely *ya*, the characteristic of the fourth conjugation.

⁴ *Fra* has been changed to *fir* by the operation of that law which is called the "harmony of the vowels," and which, although of Scythic origin, is to be traced extensively in the modern Persian.

⁵ See Radices, p. 278.

"to make to go;" but it may on the other hand be read *ya*, as the sign of the fourth class, according to which (although the compound *येष्* be of the first class) the root *इष्* is in Sanskrit conjugated¹.

In the other compounds, *atīyāisha*, "he went beyond," which has been already explained, and *patiyāisha*, "they came to," (Col. I., l. 13), the root would certainly appear to be *aish* rather than *ish*, for *atī* and *pati*, (Sans. अति and प्रति) falling upon the imperfect *aisha* from *ish*, where the initial *a* as the mere temporal augment would be short, would form, I think, *atīyāisha* and *patiyāisha*, with an unexpressed short *a* appertaining to the Cuneiform $\sqrt{<}$. To account, indeed, for the introduction of the $\overline{\text{III}}$, we must suppose the verbal form to which the particles *atī* and *pati* are prefixed to be *āisha*, and the elongation in that term could be alone caused by the fusion of the augment with the initial *a* of the root *aish*. It seems to me, therefore, most probable, that the two roots *ish* and *aish* were used indifferently in the old Persian, that they were exclusively of the first class, (the *aya* in *frāishaya* being the causal suffix²), and that, although in their pure state, they signified merely "to come," they were employed in composition to denote the opposite meaning of "going." I do not remember to have met with the roots in Zend, except in Anquetil's barbarous term *frēschttē*. (See Zend Av., tom. II., p. 450).

¹ It may, indeed, be opined, that the roots *ish* and *aish* are distinguished in the inscriptions, the former being of the fourth class, as in Sanskrit, and signifying exclusively "to go," and the latter being of the first class, as is also *esh* in Sanskrit, and having the opposite meaning of "coming." This explanation would answer sufficiently well in assigning *frāish(a)ya* to the former root, and *aisha*, *aishatā*, *patiyāisha* to the latter; but *atīyāisha* means, "he went beyond" instead of "he came beyond," and thus destroys the distinction.

² I may observe here, as a further reason for identifying *aya* as the causal suffix, that the characteristic of the fourth class is, I think, in the inscriptions uniformly *īya*. The disinclination, indeed, to admit compound groupes, seems to have led the old Persian to interpose the euphonic *i*, where in Sanskrit the suffix in *ya* would unite immediately with the root; while in the tenth class, and in causal forms where the suffix was *aya* with a prefixed vowel, such an artifice was unnecessary. I shall subsequently have occasion to give many examples of this distinction between the fourth and tenth conjugations.

𑖔 u and 'u.

𑖔 𑖔𑖔 𑖔𑖔

UTÁ, [Passim,] *Et*.

UTÁ-MAIYA, [Passim,] *Et mihi*.

UTÁ-TAIYA, [Col. IV., l. 56, p. 250, l. 75, p. 254, &c.,] *Et tibi*.

UTÁ-SHAIYA, [Col. II., l. 74, p. 223, l. 89, p. 226, &c.,] *Et illi*.

UTÁ-SHAM, [Passim,] *Et illis*.

Utá occurs also both in Sans. and in Zend (𑖔𑖔 and 𑖔𑖔), and it is no doubt etymologically allied to the Latin *et*. According to the system which derives adverbs, conjunctions, and sometimes even particles from pronominal bases, it is formed from *u* with the suffix in *tá*¹. The final 𑖔𑖔 has been originally produced by the old Persian law of elongating terminal vowels, and it frequently lapses accordingly before a suffix, as in the optional orthography of *utamaiya*. On the other hand, however, it generally happens that in this and similar formations, (compare *avadá*, "there," *avathá*, "thus," &c.) the elongation having been once given to the suffix becomes a part of the word, and is thus not subjected to elision; so that before *taiya*, *shaiya*, and *shám*, the orthography of *utá* is, I believe, constant throughout the inscriptions. I may add, that in col. iv, l. 79, at Behistun, we have the reading of *utátaya*, where the suffix of the 2nd person is contracted from *taiya* to *taya*.

𑖔 𑖔 𑖔𑖔 𑖔𑖔 𑖔𑖔 UDAPATATÁ, [Col. I., l. 36, p. 201, &c.]

Surrexit. We have here the 3rd pers. middle imperf. of a verb compounded of the particle 𑖔𑖔, "up," and the root 𑖔𑖔 *pat*, "to go;" 𑖔𑖔𑖔, being used in Sanskrit with precisely the same mean-

¹ Burnouf observes that the vowel *u*, which forms the Sans. *u-ta*, *u-pa*, the Zend *u-iti*, &c., is frequently found in the Vedas as a simple conjunction, in which state it may be presumed to have some analogy with the Semitic 𐤅. See Yaçna, sur l'Alph. Zend, p. lxiii, note 22. Gesenius has compared all the Semitic forms of the conjunction in his Lexicon, Eng. Edit., p. 288. I may add, that the same particle, used as a copulative conjunction, is of very frequent use in the Babylonian writing.

ing of "arising" or "springing up." The verb is conjugated regularly according to the first class; *apatatá*, which remains after the removal of the prefix, having the temporal augment as an initial, and the termination in *atá* for the Sanskrit *अत*. Both the particle and the root are extensively used in the cognate languages, but except in Sanskrit, I do not remember to have seen any exact correspondent of the Cuneiform compound.

𐎧 𐎠 𐎡 UPÁ, [Col. II., l. 18, p. 216, and Col. III., l. 30, p. 232,] *Apud*. A particle derived from the same pronominal base *u*, that we have seen in *utá*, and common to the old Persian, the Zend, and Sanskrit, (comp. *उप* and *𐎧𐎡*). The Greek *ὑπὸ* and Latin *apud* are of course cognate terms. *Upá* in the inscriptions governs an accusative case as in Sanskrit.

𐎧 𐎠 𐎡𐎹 𐎡𐎹𐎶 𐎡𐎹 UPASTÁM, [Passim,] *Opem, auxilium*. This is the accus. sing. of a noun compounded of *upá*, (Sans. *उप*) and of a derivative from *stá*, "to stand," (Sans. *हृ*), and literally therefore, like the Sans. *उपस्थानं*, it signifies "proximity" or "nearness." In Zend, however, *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀* is used as the exact correspondent of the Cuneiform *upastám*, to denote "help" or "assistance," as in the phrase quoted by Burnouf (*Yaçna, Notes et Eclair.*, p. xvi,) *yathá mé barēn upastām*, "that they may bring help to me." The Latin *opis, opem*, &c., are, I suspect, of cognate origin, although as *upa* becomes *ap-ud* in that language, the connexion is not immediately discernible.

𐎧 𐎠 𐎡𐎹 𐎡𐎹𐎶 UPADARMA-HYA, [Col. I., l. 74, p. 209,] *Opadarmis*. The name of the father of Atrines, who rebelled against Darius in Susiana. Etymologically the title must be compared, I think, with the Sanskrit *उपधर्मेः*, which was used to denote "a heretic" or "schismatic;" although we can hardly suppose it to have been adopted as a proper name with an offensive or depreciative signification. As the family which raised the standard of revolt in Susiana must be presumed to have been of native extraction, the self-evident Sanskrit derivation of the

nification of "destroying;" but on further consideration, I am quite at a loss to understand how *para* in the root can be contracted into *fra* in the participle, for the principle of orthographical change proceeds in exactly a contrary direction. From a Sanskrit root, in fact, पृश् or पृस्, we might have the *guna* form of *parstam* or *parastam*, as we have *𐎱𐎠𐎼𐎿* *parsta*, in Zend, and as in the inscriptions we have *kartam* from 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹; but the elision of a radical short vowel, which must take place in order to convert *paras* to *fras* appears to be altogether irregular. According to the general analogy of the Zend and Cuneiform orthography, *frastam* should be compounded of 𐎠𐎢 and a derivative from 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹, (compare Sans. प्रस्थ); yet, on the other hand, the juxta-position and evident relationship of *'ubaratam abaram* and *'ufrastam aparasam*, would seem to shew that in each of these reiterative phrases, a common root must be employed for the participle and the præterite. Here, then, is a difficulty which I am quite incompetent to solve, and which I gladly leave to the consideration of better scholars, contenting myself for the present with indicating that the translation of *'ufrastam aparasam*, "I have entirely destroyed," (lit. "well destroyed I have destroyed,") must be received with much suspicion.

𐎠𐎢 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹 𐎠𐎢𐎡𐎹 'UFRÁTAUVÁ, [Col. I., l. 92, p. 213,] *Euphrate*. We have here the name of the Euphrates in the locative sing., and we can affirm also from the orthography of the case-ending, that the old Persian noun was a feminine theme in *u*, the terminations in *auva* and *auvâ*, which are substituted for the Sans. औ¹ being clearly distinguished in the inscriptions to mark a difference of gender, (compare the masculines, *Bábirauva* and *Margauva* with the fem. *dahyauvâ*.) I believe that no great respect is now paid to the rabbinical

¹ I shall examine the locat. case-endings of themes in *u*, under the heads *Dahyáush* and *Babirush*, and will here therefore only observe, that Bopp (Comp. Gr., s. 198,) considers the termination in औ to be a corruption of आस् *as*, the gen. being substituted for the loc., of which he determines the uniform characteristic to be *i*.

etymology of הוּאֶפְרַת, (the pronoun הוּא, and פֶּרַת from פָּרָה, "to be fruitful";¹) but it seems to have escaped observation, that if we assign to the rivers of Mesopotamia the Arian derivative which their true orthography obviously presents, ('*Ufráta*, "the good and abounding (river)," from 'u, "good," *fra*, the particle of abundance, and an affix, perhaps of attribution), we must suppose an Arian to have preceded a Semitic colonization of *Shinár*. In the name of the Euphrates, the syllable *fra*, denoting "procession" or "abundance," was common to both families of languages², but we shall seek in vain for an explanation of 'u, Sans. उ, Zend ય, Gr. εϋ, in a Semitic source, and in the name of the "Tigris" also, a Sanskrit etymology will alone give the signification which the Greeks assign to the title. If then we are to suppose that the Mosaic orthographies of הוּאֶפְרַת and חוּדְקֶל, were Semitic corruptions of true Arian compounds³,

¹ See the Dissertation of Morinus prefixed to Bochart's *Phaleg*, p. 25, and Buxtorf, in voce פֶּרַת. Gesenius does not attempt to give any etymology for פֶּרַת. See Lex., Eng. Ed., p. 848.

² I thus cannot doubt but that we are to recognize the Sans. उ, Zend *fra*, &c., in a vast number of Semitic roots; compare פָּרַד, "to expound;" פָּרָה, "to be fruitful;" פָּרַח, "to flourish;" פָּרַשׁ, "to scatter," &c., &c.

³ The question at issue with regard to the etymology of the name of the Euphrates is, whether the prefix הוּא, which occurs in Gen. ii. v. 14, be really the pronoun of the 3rd pers. or a part of the proper name. All the translators undoubtedly of the Pentateuch, with the exception of the Septuagint, understood הוּא as the pronoun; in every other scriptural passage, also, the name is written simply פֶּרַת; (see Gen. ii. 15, v. 18; Deut. i. 7; Jer. ii. 18, xiii. 4, &c., &c.), and from a very early period of the Christian era, the contracted form of *Forat* (Arab. فَرَات) has been certainly alone known in the country; yet, the coincidence of the Cuneiform '*Ufráta* with the Gr. Εὐφράτης, renders it, I think, highly probable that in the expanded reading of הוּאֶפְרַת it was intended to express the true and vernacular name of the river, and that פֶּרַת was a contraction of later times. Buxtorf and Morinus pretend that the Greeks obtained their name of Εὐφράτης from a misinterpretation of the Hebrew הוּאֶפְרַת, as if Herodotus and the historians of Alexander could have borrowed from the Septuagint; while Gesenius with something more of critique, suggested that Εὐφράτης

the received ideas regarding the primitive settlement of man will be much disturbed.

[illegible]

𐎧𐏁𐎶 𐎠𐏃𐎲 𐎡𐏁𐎶 𐎢𐏁𐎶 'UVAKHSATARA-HYÁ, [Col. II., l. 81, p. 226, &c.,] *Cyaxaris*. In this name, we have, I believe, the vernacular orthography of the Greek *Kvaξάρης*; for Herodotus undoubtedly obtained his information regarding Median History at Babylon, and in the Babylonian translations at Behistun, the title is written *Huwakshara*¹. We must be careful, I think, to

came from **אֶפְרַת**, which like the Arab **فَرَات** signifies "sweet water;" but, although we undoubtedly have that term in the *Perát* or *Foráth* of Mesene, in the *Peráth* of *Bursiph* of the Talmud (*Yoma*, fol. 10), and in the *Forát bá Diklá* **فَرَاتُ بَا دِكَلَا** of the Arabs, still, as it denotes particularly "a spring of sweet water," I do not see how it could have been applied to the great river Euphrates, and moreover, it will leave the prefix 'U or Ev altogether unexplained. Hamzeh of Isfahán, I may add, an expert etymologist, adopted the usual explanation given by the Arabs, that the name arose from the "sweetness" of the waters of the river; yet he notices another Pehlevi form of the name, **فَالَادَك** *Fáládakh*, which he foolishly supposes to be a distinct title, whereas it unquestionably is nothing more than a corruption of *Frád*. In the *Bun Dehesh*, and in the Pazend hymn to the *Amshaspands*, the name occurs under the forms of *Perát* or *Frát*, almost as it is pronounced at present, (see Anquetil's *Zend Av.*, tom. II., pp. 78. 391, 392). I believe, indeed, that the Greek and old Persian, and perhaps the second chapter of Genesis, alone preserve the title in its pristine fullness.

¹ Sir W. Jones, I believe, first undertook to compare the Greek *κα* in this name with the Persian *ک* *kai*, prefixed to all the titles of the kings of the Kaianian dynasty; and Burnouf, who has elaborately examined the Zend *𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *kava*, is inclined to approve of the assimilation, (see Yaçna, p. 454, note 316). Wester-

all the case-endings which commence with *a*, (nom. *a* for *as*; accus. *am*; and loc. *aiya* for *é*), while the latter is used in the nom. plur. of the ethnic title (*'Uvajiyā*), where the subjectival suffix in *ya*, preceded by the euphonic *i*, is attached immediately to the base¹.

'UVÁDAIDAYA, [Col. III., l. 51, p. 234.]

Chodedia. The name of a city of Persis, which must have been of some consequence, as it was selected for the place of execution of the great Persian rebel *Vahyazdāta*. I am however totally unable to identify it either in ancient or modern geography; and it would be a mere waste of time, therefore, to seek for its meaning or etymology.

(ክ ብይ ጠ ብሢ ደገ ሸ ነጽ ጸ) 'Uvámarsihyush,
 [Col. I., l. 43, p. 201,] *Se impatientem habens.* I consider this to

be a verbal noun formed with the *unādi* affix in उ, the elements of the theme being 'uva, "self," the privative a, and मृष, "to bear" or "suffer," conjugated in the fourth class, and with the euphonic i interposed between the conjugational suffix and the root². The only irregularity, indeed, which this analysis presents to a Sanskrit formation, is the introduction of the characteristic of the fourth class between the root and the *unādi* affix, and of this peculiar construction we have another example in *Dar(a)-yavush*. The particle signifying "self" prevails under nearly similar forms in all the cognate languages, (comp. Sans. स्व; Zend *hva*; Gr. *σφε*, &c.; Lat. *su-us*, &c.; Pers. *خو* in

¹ It is however sufficiently remarkable, that we have the term 'Uvajasya with the >Y<, used for the sing. of the ethnic title, in col. 4, l. 10, at Behistun, the locat. being either irregularly substituted for the adjectival form, or as I think more probable, the >Y< being an error of the engraver for >Σ<.

^a मृष् in Sanskrit is conjugated in the first, fourth, and tenth classes, but the fourth is that which the root principally affects, (see Westergaard's Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 293). In the old Persian, I suppose the fourth to be distinguished from the tenth class by the respective forms of *iya* for the suffix in य, and *aya* for that in अय.

am inclined to discover in the first element of the compound, स्व (or *swár* with the *a* elongated, as in स्वाराज,) "Heaven," and I would further suggest, that with this term, or with its cognate form स्वर्ग¹, we are to compare not only the true primitive orthography of 'Uvázramiya, but the Ῥορυῶ of Procopius², and the still more corrupted name of جورجانية *Júrjáníyah*, which was applied by the Arabs to the capital of the province³. The affix of locality, however, which was added to *Swár* or *Hwár* to form 'Uvázramiya, I am unable to identify. The early Arabs pronounced the name *Khuwázram* (خوارزم), retaining the euphonic *u* of the Cuneiform between the hard aspirate and the *w*, but the modern Persians, according to a system of contraction which is universal throughout the language, and which may be traced, I suspect, to the anomalous employment of the Zend character 𐬬 , although they continue to write خوارزم, read the name with the shortened sound of *Khárizm*.

In the indifferent orthography of 'Uvázramish and 'Uvázramiya, we have an example of the uncertainty with which the old Persian language regarded a foreign theme in *i*, sometimes immediately attaching to it its proper case-endings, and at other times changing it to a noun of the first class by the addition of the euphonic *ya*. The Median language, also, in representing the name of *Khárizm* followed the same double orthography⁴.

¹ *Swarga*, through the Pehlevi, has also produced *Khang*, the famous کنگدز *Gangdis* of Persian fable, which may have been in *Khárizm*, although more probably about *Khoten*.

² See De Bello Persico, lib. I., c. 3 and 4.

³ *Júrjáníyah* is of course Arabicized from *Gúrgáníyah*, and was perfectly distinct from the *Gurgán*, (*Vehrkán* or *Υρκανία*) of the Caspian. The ruins of *Júrjáníyah* are still to be seen on a branch of the old Oxus.

⁴ See the passage in the *Hamasa*, quoted by Müller in the *Journ. Asiatique* for April, 1839, p. 302.

⁵ At Behistun, also, the *x* appears to be rejected in the Median orthography of the name, (as in the *Χορμύιοι* of Ctesias,) although a sibilant is retained at Nakhsh-i-Rustam. The Babylonian form of the name at the latter place is unfortunately mutilated, but I think that it nearly reproduces the Persian pronunciation.

derived from the root तश्, "to carve," which is 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tash* in Zend; but all this appears to me to be very doubtful. I am especially embarrassed with the form of the first sibilant; for if, as Lassen supposes¹, it were substituted for the dental (*us* for *ut*, before a word commencing with *t*²), or if *us* corresponded with خوش, we should, I think, have the form of 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌, the *u* in such a position exercising its power of aspiration. I am obliged, therefore, to read *usatashanám*, and I know not whether the division be *usa-tashanám* or *'u-sata-shanám*. If the former be the correct reading, *usa* may be referred to the Zend 𐬀𐬎𐬌 *us*, "intelligence" or "skill³," and *tashanám* may have the signification before assigned to it, the compound epithet meaning "skilfully executed;" but if we adopt the second division, *'u* will stand for 𐬀𐬎𐬌, "well," *sata* will be the Sanskrit शत, "an hundred," and *shaná* will still have to be identified. I will only add, then, that the term is in the accus. case, and that as it agrees with the masc. pron. *imam*, the elongation of the last syllable is probably one of the grammatical errors with which the Inscription of Artaxerxes is throughout disfigured.

𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬌 'USHKA-HYÁ, [Ins. No. 4, l. 13, p. 280,] *Terræ firmæ* (*quasi terrestris*). The correspondents of the Cuneiform *'ushka*, are in Sans. शुष्क *sushka*; in Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌 *hushka*; in Kurdish *hushk*; and in Pers. خشک *khushk*. Doubtless the Sanskrit root was originally written with the 𐬔, (as we still find it in सुषि

¹ See Lassen's Memoir in the Zeitschrift, p. 165.

² I doubt much whether this orthographical law of the Zend can be applied to the language of the inscriptions. If however *Vishtáspa* be given as an example, the sibilant is at any rate shown to be aspirated.

³ This word in modern Persian is هوش, *hush*, but it may exist in its old form in اوستاد *ustád*, "a master," with which I compare the name of *Osthanes*, as well as the Armenian title of *ustán* 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌, and perhaps the Ἀστάνδας of Suidas. See St. Martin's Armenia, tom. I., p. 340, and the quotations in Brisson's de Reg. Pers. Princ., p. 190.

I should desire to find some meaning for it, like the Persian *دار* *dār*, *uzmayāpatiya akunavam* being equivalent to *بر دار کردم* *bar dār kardam*¹; for it certainly refers to some method of capital punishment, and "crucifixion" or "impalement," was that to which political offenders among the early Persians were most usually condemned²; but I have searched in vain for any Zend or Sanskrit correspondent³. Inviting, therefore, further inquiry into the Cuneiform *uzmaya*, (which is, I think, the true orthography, as the sonant *z* appears to affect combination with the sonants rather than the surds, compare *A'uramazdā*, *azdā*, *'Ud-razmiya*, &c.), I content myself with retaining the purely conjectural reading of "I crucified," for *uzmayāpatiya akunavan*.

𐎧𐎠 k.

𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 KATAPATUKA, [Col. I., l. 15, 16, p. 197,]

Cappadocia. The *Katapataka* or *Καπαδοκία* of the inscriptions would appear to include all Asia Minor north of the Taurus, for there is no other country named between Armenia on the east, and the Grecian colonies to the west. Dr. Prichard has ably examined the orthography of ancient Cappadocia, and appears inclined to attach the nation to the Indo-Germanic family⁴. Its claim however to a Semitic brotherhood seems to me to rest on a surer foundation. The descent of the ancient kings of the Lydians, a neighbouring, and probably, therefore, a cognate race, from Argon, the son of Ninus, the son of Belus⁵, the fact that its inhabitants retained the name of *λευκοὶ Σύριοι* or "white

¹ *بر دار* *bar dār* is literally, "upon the tree," but united with *kardan*, "to do," it is applied to "hanging," "impaling," or perhaps, "crucifying."

² See Herod., lib. VI., c. 30, and Lib. VII., c. 238.

³ I can neither venture to compare *𐎧𐎠𐎧𐎠𐎧𐎠* *aśma*, Persian *هشیم* *hisam*, "wood," for the initial change would be too violent, nor, knowing also, as we do, the reverence with which the early Persians regarded the elements, the signification which would be obtained from *𐎧𐎠*, "to burn," or *𐎧𐎠*: "fire;" (Pers. *سوز* *sus*.)

⁴ *Researches*, &c., &c., vol. III., p. 497.

⁵ Herod., l. I., c. 7.

Syrians," as late as the time of Strabo¹; and their worship of the Babylonian deities, *Anaitis* and *Omanus*, mentioned by the same author²; furnish arguments which support each other; and to these arguments must be now added, the presumptive proof afforded by the inscriptions, of a Semitic origin for the name. In the Babylonian orthography of the name, indeed, the initial power is a sibilant; and that this must have been the true and not the corrupted form, I infer from finding a similar instance of transmutation in the name of *Nabokodrossor*, which was of course a pure Semitic compound³; while there is not, I believe, a single example of such a change in any title of undoubted Arian derivation. The Persians, in fact, I conceive to have been inclined to harden the Semitic sibilants, while the Babylonians rarely or ever softened the Arian gutturals; and as we have the two powers in the respective orthographies of Cappadocia, it follows that the Semitic form may be assumed without much chance of error, to be the primitive and vernacular title. At the same time, I am not prepared to offer any conjectural etymology for the Semitic *Satapatuka*⁴.

¹ Strabo, l. XVI., c. 737. Herod. in two passages, l. I. 72, and l. VII. 72, states expressly, that Syrian was the Greek, and Cappadocian the Persian name; and Dionys. v. 772; Apollonius, l. III., and Ptol. lib. V., c. 6, may be all quoted to prove the Assyrian descent of the Cappadocians. Pharnaces, however, who married Atossa, sister of Cambyes, the great-grandfather of Cyrus the Great, and who was the fifth ancestor of Anaphas, one of the seven conspirators, must have been, I think, of Arian descent. See Frag. of Diod. Sicul. in Phot. Biblio., p. 1158.

² Strabo, l. XV., p. 733; *Anaitis* is certainly a Babylonian name, commencing with *ana*, "a God;" and I take *Omanus* to be the same as the *Chomæan Apollo* of Ammianus, lib. XXIII., c. 6, who was worshipped at *Humânia*, the *Χοίμανα* of Ptol., l. V., c. 20.

³ It is true, that at Behistun the name of Nabochodrossor, is every where written with a sibilant in the Babylonian copies; but on all the pure Babylonian monuments I now find the guttural to be usually retained; and I am inclined, accordingly, to regard it as the primitive form. The interchanging, indeed, of the guttural and sibilant was probably admitted generally by the Babylonians, and the arguments, therefore, that the Semitic *Satapatuka* is an older form than the Arian *Katapataka*, must, I fear, be abandoned. The same interchange is still common in the dialects of India.

⁴ A curious etymologist, however, relying on the traditions which connect Armenia and Phrygia with the Flood, might find *𐤔𐤕𐤕*, "a flood," in the name of *Satapataka*.

agrees is masc.) I suppose it to be the ablat. suffix of the 1st pers. sing., which also occurs in *hacháma*, "from me," and *paruvama*, "before me," and which is here strangely enough appended to an adjective, the compound *kamanama*, signifying "desirous of me," or by a slight extension of the meaning "faithful to me¹." The instrumental plural *kamanaibish*, at any rate, which occurs in connexion with *asbáraibish* and *martiyaibish*, can only signify "faithful." *Káma*, also, which is from the same root, is evidently identical with the Sans. काम्, "agreeably to desire," but the particle is used in the inscriptions as a postposition governing the accus. case, *mám káma*, which is met with in two passages, meaning "according to my wish." I am not aware that there are any correspondents either in Zend or Persian.

𐎧𐎠𐎧𐎡𐎧𐎡𐎧𐎡 KARAKÁ, [Insc. No. 6, l. 30, p. 294.] *Carchii*.

In my observations on the Geographical list at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, I have attempted to apply this name to the Greeks, but on further consideration, I see much reason to doubt the identification². The concluding names of that list appear to be more reasonably explained as the great independent tribes who inhabited the interior of Persia³, and in this view I venture to assimilate the *Karaká* with the Καρχαῖοι, who, in conjunction with the Cossæans and Corbienæ, are placed by Polybius along the skirts of the mountains on the south-west frontier of Media⁴. Of the Carchians nothing positive, I believe, is known in history beyond the solitary notice of Polybius; but as they appear in the inscriptions to be associated with the Mardi (*Mádaiyá*!) it is very possible they may have given the name of Χάραξ to the Mardian

¹ Perhaps it would be more correct to consider *kaman* in the compound *kamanama* as a preposition, signifying "desirous of;" for the orthography of *paruvama* and *anuvama* shows the ablative affix of the 1st pers. to be *ama*, (not *ma*), and the coalition of such an affix with the nominat. of an adjective should give the reading of *kamanáma* by the sandhi of the two short *a*'s.

² Lassen compares the Καλακινί of Assyria, or the Χαρακηνή of Susiana, but I see strong objections to either of these explanations; nor do I think Westergaard's application of the name either to the Colchians or Georgians, deserving of any serious notice. See Zeitschrift, &c., p. 97; and Westergaard's Mem., p. 305.

³ I thus read for *Tak(a)bará*, *Putiyá*, *Kushiyá*, *Mádaiyá*, and *Karaká*, the Tiberenes, the Vitii, Cossæans, Mardi, and Carchians.

⁴ Polyb., l. V. c. 5; the Corbienæ may be compared with the Corbiane of Strabo, and Mt. Charban of Pliny.

settlement, established by the Arsacide Phraates, near the Caspian Straights'. With less hesitation also, I connect their names with that of the city of كرج *Karaj*², which was near their original seat, and the title of which is still preserved in the *Kereh rúd* رود كره of central Irák.

𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎹 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎹 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎹

KART-A, [Insc. No. 10, p. 314,] *Factus*.

KART-AM, [Passim,] *Factum*.

KART-Á, [Insc. No. 19. l. 31 and 35, p. 342,] *Factor*.

KARIYISH (? - - - , [Insc. No. 7, l. 9, p. 312,] — ?

KÁR-A, [Passim,] *Copias—regnum*.

KÁRAM, [Passim,] *Copias—regnum*.

KÁRÁ, [Passim,] *Copias—regno*.

KÁRAHYÁ, [Passim,] *Copiarum—regni*.

KÁRASHIM, [Col. I., l. 50, p. 204,] *Regnum illum*.

I derive all these from the root signifying "to do," which is 𐎧 in Sans., 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎹 *kērē* in Zend, and کر *kar* in Persian³. *Karta* and *kartam* are, it appears to me, the masc. and neut. forms of the past participle, (comp. कर्तः and 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎹𐎠𐎡𐎹 *kērētēm*), but it is possible that the latter term may be sometimes used as a neuter noun, like the Gr. *ἔργον*, and Latin *factum*⁴. *Kartá*, also, must

¹ See the Parthian stations of Isidore, p. 6. *Xápaξ* would seem to be *Damávend*, but it may be *Karrej*, on the *Karrej rúd*, near Teheran.

² *Karaj* was re-established by the famous *Abu Dalaf*, in the tenth century, and was of sufficient consequence to be formed into a Christian Bishopric. See the tables of Elias Damas. in *Assemanus*, tom. II., p. 463. The ruins of *Karaj* are still to be seen on the *Kereh rúd*, near *Sultánábád*; *Kerkha*, on the Choaspes, together with *Xáπαξ Σπασίνου*, or كرخ میسان and the numerous *Karkhs*, on or about the Tigris, I suppose to represent one and all the simple Chaldee ܡܕܢܚ, "a fort," or "city;" Syriac ܡܕܢܚ.

³ I shall examine under the head *Ku*, the remarkable circumstance of that root taking the place of *Kri* throughout the simple verbal conjugation, and shall give my reasons for disbelieving in the identity of the roots, which is, however, stated by Lassen as an established fact.

⁴ It is extraordinary that Lassen should persist in translating *karta* and *kartam*, "a palace," and still more surprising that Westergaard should approve of the reading, remarking, as he has done, that the Median translations employ the same root for *kartam* and *akunaush*. See his Median Memoir, p. 354.

be, I think, the nom. sing. of the verbal noun in कृ, (compare कर्त्त), employed, as is very frequently the case in Zend, for the præterite. The mutilated *Kariyish* - - - is completed by Lassen to *Kariyishiyāmiya* and compared with the Sanskrit future कर्त्तव्यामि¹, but with so doubtful an orthography and with no support whatever from the context, I cannot attach much weight to his identification.

Kāra is of course a derivative from the same root, corresponding with the Sans. कर्त्त, and Persian کَر *kār*. I do not think, however, it is ever used in the inscriptions in the sense of "a deed" or "action." Signifying originally "the doer of an action," it is applied to any executive body, and thus denotes equally "military forces," and "a nation" or "population," viewed as an abstract object. I translate it therefore by "an army," or "the state," according to the context. The declension is perfectly regular, with the exception of the instrumental *kārā* for *kārena*; and in this particular instance the Persian is certainly more ancient than the Sanskrit form; for Professor Bopp has proved the original case-ending of the instrum. sing. to be long *ā*, and the Sans. nasal to have been introduced for euphony². We have not, I believe, in the inscriptions any example of this noun in the ablat.; but it would undoubtedly in that case present the same orthography of *kārā* for *kārāt*³. In *kārashim* we have the accus. suffix of the 3rd person united to the noun in the nominative, which is an unusual formation. The root occurs frequently in composition with *pati*, *pari*, *chiya*, &c., and perhaps even we have a reduplicate form in *chakhriyā*. I shall examine all these terms however in their proper alphabetical order.

𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍

rogative base *ka* and the indefinite suffix¹. The exact Sanskrit correspondent is कश्चि, and if the compound occurred in Zend, of which I am doubtful, it would be written کاشچیا, as we have the analogous form of کاشچا *kaçcha*. With regard to the varying orthography of *kash* and *ká*, we must remember that the language of the inscriptions would properly represent the Sans. masc. nom. कः by *ka*, but that before the enclitical particle *chiya* (for *chit*), the sibilant case-ending च्च would re-appear; while on the other hand, the brevity of the simple form *ka* would probably cause its final vowel to be elongated, as in *vá* and *chá*, for व and च. In Sanskrit, as Professor Bopp has observed, the addition of चि removes from the interrogative expression preceding it its interrogative force²; and this will exactly explain the sense of "any one," which appertains to the Cuneiform *kashchiya*. In regard to *ká*, however, which has the same indefinite sense, I must add that the Sanskrit pronoun did not necessarily imply an interrogative, but that according to the fifth meaning of Wilson, it also denoted "kind" or "sort," and that this is certainly the application of the term in the inscriptions; for *tuvaṃ ká hya aparaṃ ahyā* can only be translated "thou *whosoever* who mayst be hereafter." We cannot exactly compare the Latin "*quisque*" with *kashchiya*, for "*quis*," answers to the nom. *chish* or *kis*, and is derived from another interrogative case *ki*; but the indefinite suffix "*que*," which occurs in *quisque*, *uterque*, &c., and which is probably cognate with *ce* in *hic-ce*, *is-ce*, &c., is no doubt identical with *chiya*, a term that I shall further examine in considering the masc. nom. *chish*. M. Burnouf has devoted six pages of elaborate commentary to the explanation of the Zend *kaçe*³, (where the final letter is written in different passages of the Zend Avesta,

¹ Bopp has some excellent remarks on the interrogative bases generally, and on this pronoun in particular, in his *Comp. Gr.*, ss. 390 and 398; he considers *chit*, which is common to the Zend and Sanskrit, to be a neuter form altered from *kis*, which again comes from the base *ki*.

² I mention this, as the final elongation, which is common in verbs, adverbs, &c., does not occur generally in the nom. masc. of nouns or pronouns, where *a* stands for अः.

³ See *Comp. Gram.*, Eng. Ed., vol. II., p. 561.

⁴ See *Yaçna*, note R, from p. 133 to p. 139.

», ξ, and ς; ε, ε, and ι); but he has omitted to compare the term with the Persian کسى *kasé*, “a certain person,” with which however it appears to be identical, and in which the final vowel is certainly an affix of individuality, *kasé* being exactly equivalent to *yek kas*.

$\Upsilon = \text{𐎲} \text{𐎠} \text{𐎡} \text{𐎢}$ $\Upsilon = \text{𐎲} = < \text{𐎶} \text{𐎢}$ KÁPISHKÁNISH, [Col. III., l. 59, 60, p. 235.] *Capiscanis*. The name of a fort in Arachosia, where the Satrap of the province repulsed the invasion of a rebel force from Persis. I am much inclined to believe that the affixes in *án* and *kán*, which under a multitude of forms appear in so very many of the Greek orthographies of old Arian geographical titles, are in reality plural characteristics attached to the proper name of the tribe inhabiting the spot; and although we cannot trace such plural forms in any known ancient languages connected with Persia¹, except the Chaldee and Pehlevi, both of the Semitic family, I still suppose them to be of the remotest antiquity, borrowed, perhaps, from races which long preceded the settlement of Arian nations westward of the *Belút Tágh*.

Without pursuing further then at present so obscure a subject, I will merely suggest that in the term *Kápiśhkanish*, we may have this plural termination appended to the proper name *Kápiśh*, the ethnic title being afterwards converted to a geographical designation by the addition of an affix of locality. This conjecture indeed derives, I think, some support from our finding the *Kapishes*, or "brown men," (from कपिशः, "brown," the sibilant being aspirated before the *k*) settled in other parts of Ariana, as well as upon the western frontier, where we must suppose to

¹ Bopp, indeed, (Comp. Gr., s. 240) remarks, that the plural termination in *án* of the modern Persian for animate creatures, is certainly adopted from the Sans. accus. plur. in *ज्ञान*, in the same way as the Spanish employs the Latin accus. for the affix of the plural number; but it would be more correct, I think, to say that the accus. case-ending of the Sans. in *án* is a relic of the true and universal plural affix, of which, indeed, we have also, perhaps, another trace in the gen. case-ending in *ánám*, although Bopp determines the *n* in that suffix to be euphonic. Müller, also, (Essai sur le Pehl., p. 300,) has explained the guttural in the Persian plural ending in *گان* *gán*, as the reproduction of the old sing. suffix of the Pehlevi in *k, q*.

have been situated the *Kápišhkánish* of the inscriptions. I allude of course to the famous *Capissa* in *Capissene*, under the Indian Caucasus, which existed as early as the time of Cyrus, for the city was destroyed in that monarch's Scythic expedition; which as the *Kiapishe* of the Chinese rose again into so much celebrity about the fifth century of Christ, and the ruins of which are to be seen at the present day, still retaining the name of *Kafshán*, in the *Ghúrband* Pass, about fifty miles north of *Kábul*¹.

I conclude that the *Kápišhkánish* of the inscriptions must have been in the direction of Seistan, as the Satrap of Arachosia would probably have met the force advancing from Persis on the frontier of his province, but in that quarter modern geography affords no clue to its identification.

𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 KAUF, [Col. I., l. 37, p. 201,] *Mons.* I am not aware that there is any correspondent for this term in Zend or Sanskrit; but it occurs frequently both in Pehlevi and Parsi, (compare واك in the one, and كوپ in the other,) and in modern Persian it still exists under the slightly altered form of كوه *koh*. It was probably borrowed by the Persians with many other vocables from a Scythic source, for cognate forms are still extensively used in the dialects of that family, as in the Hungarian *koe* and *köv*, the Finnish *ku*, and perhaps even the Turkish *kaya*, "a stone." That the radical vowel was in the Persian term affected with the *guna* may be inferred, as well from the form of the guttural 𐬕, which cannot coalesce immediately with the *u*, as from the employment of the *o* in the Greek correspondents, which represents the diphthong more regularly than the primitive vowel. Compare the *Κόφης* and *Κωφῆνη* of Eastern Ariana, the latter of which has the equivalent name of *Kohistán* to the present day², and also *Κωφῆν*, the ancient capital

¹ Without pressing conjecture too far, I may also, perhaps, suppose "the brown" men of *Capissa* to have been especially distinguished from the neighbouring "white horde," who dwelt in 'Οπροσπάνα, the *Sepito-falasse* of the Chinese. Lassen, who in his *Bactrian Memoir*, has compared *Capissa* with the Chinese *Kiapishe*, does not appear to have been aware of the existence of the ruins of *Kafshán*, at the foot of the Pass of the same name, leading from the *Ghurband* valley over the *Hindú Kush*. See *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. IX., part I., p. 484.

² Lassen's *Bactrian Memoir*, translated in the *Journal of the Asiatic Soc. of Bengal*, (see particularly No. 101 of the *Journal*,) may be consulted with advant-

of Arachosia, which gave the Chinese name of *Kaofu*, (and perhaps *Kipin* also) to the neighbouring country, and which, in the Mongol title of *Olán Robdt* attaching to the ruins, still retains the distinctive epithet of "hill (city)," that was originally attached to it from its situation at the foot of the mountains¹. It has been surmised also that we have the same term *kauf* or *koh* in the Gr. *Κάκασος*, the name signifying literally "the mountains of the *Kás*," (comp. "*Casia regio*," of Ptol.); but the identification is not susceptible of proof².

I am induced to consider the noun of the eighth declension of Wilkins, and to write *kauf* accordingly instead of *kaufa*, from observing that in no instance throughout the inscriptions does the letter 𐎧 open on a vowel. The theme probably is *kaup* rather than *kauf*, the surd labial being used in Pehlevi and Parsi, and the silent 𐎧 may have been substituted for 𐎦 in the nom. on the same principle which caused the 𐎧𐎶 to be replaced by 𐎧𐎦 in the nom. of *daraug*, "a lie." These delicate questions of orthographical structure, must, however, with our present limited materials, necessarily remain obscure.

age for the geographical illustration of the *Κάφης* and *Καφῆνη*, but the etymology of the names is unnoticed by him.

¹ Pliny and Stephen, following the same authority, name the capital of Arachosia, Cophen, and the measurements of the geographers leave no doubt of the position of the city. *Olán*, I may add, in Mongol, exactly answers to the modern *koh* and ancient *kauf*, "a hill," or "mountain."

² The Armenians thus name the Caucasus *Kokas*, Կոկաս; or *Khabgokh*, from the latter of which apparently comes the Arabic قباخ *Kabakh*, and in all these terms we have the labial, which occurs in *kauf*, represented by the Greek *κ* in *κάν*. I suspect even that the famous *Káf*, of eastern romance, is nothing more than a corruption of *kauf*, "a hill."

⟨Y k (uniting with u).

⟨Y ⟨Y

KU. From this verbal root we have the following derivations.

KUN(A)VAHYA, [Col. IV., l. 75, p. 254, and l. 79, p. 256,]

Facias.

AKUNAVAM, [Passim,] *Feci.*

AKUNAUSH, [Passim,] *Fecit.*

AKUN(A)VA, [Passim,] *Fecerunt.*

AKUMÁ, [Col. I., l. 90, p. 211, l. 94, p. 213, &c.,] *Fecimus.*

AKUN(A)VATÁ, [Col. III., l. 12, p. 230.]

AKUN(A)VATÁ, [Insc. No. 6, l. 37, p. 298.]

AKUN(A)VAYATÁ, [Col. I., l. 20, p. 198, and l. 24, p. 199,] *Factum est.*

AKUTÁ, [Col. I., l. 47, p. 203,] *Egit.*

As Lassen has announced the absolute identity of the roots *ku* and *kri*, the former being a mere orthographical degradation of the latter, it is necessary that I should state my reasons for still maintaining a distinction. In the first place, then, I can discern no sufficient reason for the change of *kri* into *ku*. Lassen says it arose from the influence of the following *u* in the conjugational characteristic¹, but I cannot admit the application to the language of the inscriptions of the Zend law of epenthesis, nor if the euphonic *u* were introduced do I see any necessity for contracting *kru* into *ku*². I must observe in the next place, that *kri* or *kar*, although unused in the simple verbal conjugation, occurs in its own proper form in composition, (compare *parikriydhya*, &c.); while, that it cannot be the mere orthographical influence of the sign of the fifth class which changes *kri* to *ku*, is shown not only

¹ See Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 246.

² It is true that the Sans. *kri* becomes *kur*, before the heavy personal endings and throughout the potential, the orthographical change being attributed, by Bopp, partly to the influence of the liquid *r*, which affects the vowel *u*, and partly to the weight of the suffixes; (Comp. Gr., s. 490,) and without having recourse therefore to the Zend law of epenthesis, there would be sufficient authority for supposing the old Persian to have substituted *kur* for *kar*, but the elision of the *r*, of which Lassen summarily disposes, still appears to me an insuperable objection to the identity of *ku* and *kri*. I must add, at the same time, that there is an instance of the same elision in the Vedic particip. कृत्, quoted by Westergaard, from the Nirukta, 5; 24.

by the term *akumá*, where the characteristic, though no longer apparent, may have once existed, but also by *akutá*, which must, as I think, be the præterite of another conjugation. I will not pretend at the same time to assert, that the roots *ku* and *kri* may not have been in their origin cognate. They are certainly used in the inscriptions, the one for the other, with an exact identity of signification; they are confounded in the conjugation of the verb in modern Persian, (compare *کنم kunam*, "I do," with "*kardam*," *کردم*, "I did"). Neither the Sanskrit nor the Zend affords any radically distinct correspondent for *ku*, while they appear to conjugate *kri* and *kērē* in the fifth class¹, with a near assimilation to the forms used in the inscriptions, and it is very possible, therefore, that in some earlier stage of the Cuneiform language the roots may have been one and the same. All then that I will venture to suggest is, that in the age of Darius, the old Persian language had so far individualized the roots, as to employ *kri* or *kar* in the part. verbal noun, and in composition; while *ku* was used in all the ordinary verbal formations of the fifth class, and was even sufficiently distinguished to admit of conjugation in the second class, when the signification required to be modified from a transitive to a neuter application. This explanation I have derived from the actual examples furnished by the inscriptions; but I leave it to the consideration of better scholars, whether it may not also serve to support the distinction of the Vedic scholiasts, who refer all the forms of the fifth class to an independent (although of course a cognate) root *कृक् kriv*, the existence of which has been doubted, owing to the disappearance of the radical *क्*, (retained perhaps in the Cuneiform *𐎧*), from the various Sanskrit derivatives.

I shall now briefly compare the terms which occur in the inscriptions with their Sanskrit correspondents, but shall refrain as much as possible from drawing general inferences from the examples, regarding Cuneiform conjugation, as any deep inquiry

¹ In this I follow Wilson and Rosen, but it must be observed that the Indian grammarians distinguish clearly between the Vedic *कृक् kriv*, of the fifth class, and the classical *कृ kri*, of the first and eighth classes, and that Westergaard adopts and illustrates the distinction. See Wilson's Dict., p. 240; Rig Vedæ Spec., Notes, p. 19; and Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 58 and 256.

into the old Persian grammar would hardly be suited to a Vocabulary. The root *ku*, then, with the transitive signification of "doing (something)," may be considered to be exclusively of the fifth class¹. I do not compare *kun(a)váhya* with कृणोषि *krinóshi*, or کرینوشی *kērénúshi*², but rather suppose it to be the 2nd pers. sing. of the present subjunctive, which if the term occurred in the Vedas, would be, I believe कृणासि *krinvási*³, and as I am doubtful if the languages of the inscriptions admitted of the groupe *nv*, I place the supposed *guna* of the characteristic in this and all similar formations in a parenthesis.

In writing *akunavam* for the 1st pers. sing. of the act. imperf., instead of *akunvam* with Lassen, I follow the regular Sanskrit orthography of which Wilkins gives an example in असुनवं *asunavam*. The form *akunavush* is of particular interest; for it not only shows, by the employment of the <v>, instead of <<v>, that the old Persian certainly employed the *guna* in expressing the conjugational characteristic; but it also preserves, as I think, a more ancient personal termination than the dental of the Zend and Sanskrit⁴; *us* occurs in the classical Sanskrit as the ending of the 3rd person under four different conditions, but its employment is restricted to the plur. number, and it is thus compared with the Greek ους⁵. I am not sure, however, that it is not also met with in the Vedas, representing the 3rd pers. sing. of

¹ For an analysis of the suffix in *nv*, Bopp must be consulted. Comp. Gr., s. 109^a, 4.

² See Bopp's Comp. Gr., s. 447.

³ Bopp (Comp. Gr., s. 713) merely observes, that the Vedic *let* or subjunctive is distinguished from the indicative by the lengthening of the vowel of the class-syllable. I judge, however, from the inscriptions, that the distinction is in reality the introduction of an additional short *a* before the personal endings; *a+a* in the first class, &c., becoming *á*, but in the second class the short additional *a* alone intervening between the root and the termination. Comp. *astiya*, indic., and *ahatiya*, subjunctive.

⁴ I say more ancient, as the true pronominal base of the 3rd pers. in Sans. is *sa*; and *ta* merely occurs in the secondary forms. Bopp and Gesenius, however, are agreed that, taking the whole range of language, the latter is anterior to the former.

⁵ In the potential; the imperf. of reduplicated roots; the imperf. of roots in *á* of the second class; and in some instances in the multiform preterite. See Comp. Gr., s. 462, and Burnouf's Yaçna, Notes, p. 147.

the imperf. There is at any rate a word *á-ri-noh* in the 30th Hymn of the Rig Veda, where it has this power, and where, in order to explain the form, the scholiast is obliged to suppose the 2nd pers. to be irregularly substituted for the 3rd¹. Whether at the same time this identification be admitted, or whether we consider *aush* to be a weakening of *ot*, is of no great consequence. The termination is also found in *adarshanaush*, and is certainly therefore, in the language of the inscriptions, the regular characteristic of the 3rd pers. sing. of the act. imperf. of the fifth class.

I now come to the plural forms of the same tense *akun(a)va* in the 3rd pers., and *akumá* in the 1st. *Akun(a)va* is the Vedic अकृवन् *akrinvan*, the silent terminal being elided, and I compare *akumá* with the Sans. form असुन् *asunma*², which is used equally, according to Wilkins, with असुनुम् *asunuma*, and in representing which in the Cuneiform, the *n*, although performing an important grammatical function, is necessarily expunged as the first member of a compound consonant articulation. The dialectic elongation of the final *a* in all such verbal formations has been frequently remarked on as a peculiarity of the old Persian language.

The 3rd pers. of the middle imperfect *akun(a)vátá* presents a difficulty; it occurs in two passages, in one apparently as a singular, for the nom. is *dahyáush*; in the other, it is certainly a plural, being in immediate relation to the plural suffix in *shám*. Now *akun(a)vátá* will answer sufficiently well to the Vedic plural अकृवन्त *akrinvata*, formed like the Sans. असुन्वन्त *asunvata*³; but it will not correspond with the sing. *akrinuta*, and it is possible,

¹ See Rig Vedæ Spec., p. 48, and Rosen's remarks on the passage in the Adnotationes, p. 66.

² Wilkins merely gives it as a rule, that the *u* of the conjugational suffix may be occasionally dropped before व् and न्, but he does not explain the principle of this orthographical change. Bopp, however, would I suppose attribute the elision to the weight of those consonants which cannot tolerate the light *u*.

³ In Sanakrit, as we know, the *guna* is only admitted before the light terminations, or those distinguished according to the grammarians by a servile व्, which in the middle voice are unknown, except in the 1st pers. of the imperative, but I cannot satisfy myself that this rule applied to the language of the inscriptions, and I therefore give an optional *guna* throughout.

therefore, that in the aforesaid passage, *dahydush* may be used as a noun of multitude. If, however, it be determined that *akun(a)vatá* is exclusively a plural form, a question will then arise whether the singular of the middle imperfect may not be *akutá*, *akunutá* being shortened to *akuntá* and subsequently to *akutá*, as *akunumá* was contracted to *akunmá*, and ultimately to *akumá*. I should be inclined, I confess, to accept of this explanation, regardless that, although we have in Sanskrit the optional orthography of *asunma* in the active, the corresponding contraction of *asunta* in the middle is wanting¹, did I not also find the meaning of the root in *akutá* to have undergone a modification, which seems to point to the employment of a different conjugation. I cannot of course be positive, but influenced by the latter consideration, and remembering that in no other verbal formation is there any visible difference between the sing. and plur. of the 3rd pers. of the middle imperfect, I prefer accordingly regarding *akun(a)vatá* as an irregular substitute for the singular *akunutá*², and attaching *akutá* to the second class.

The next term to be considered is *akun(a)vyatá*, where we have the anomalous employment of the conjugational suffix in the passive voice, a peculiarity of construction which is of much interest, inasmuch as it connects the old Persian with the Greek and Gothic, and distinguishes it from the Zend and Sanskrit³. Independently of this there is nothing remarkable in the Cuneiform term, except that the *guna* is perhaps employed in the conjugational suffix in the place of the vowel-lengthening of the Sanskrit, which distinguishes roots in *u* in the passive voice, and that the conjunctive vowel *a*, being introduced between the suffix and the passive characteristic, converts that vowel into *o*. I do not think we can possibly read *akun(a)vyatá*, for if the suffix

¹ The *u* appears to lapse in *asunma* from the weight of the labial *m*, an influence which would not be felt in *asunuta*, where the personal sign commences with a dental, and this accordingly is a further proof against the possible contraction of *asuntá*.

² If *akun(a)vatá* be admitted as the substitute of the Vedic *अकृनुत* *akrínuta*, we must suppose, of course, that the old Persian, in the fifth conjugation as in the first, employed the connecting vowel *a* between the personal-endings and the class suffix, and of this peculiarity we appear to have another example in *kunaváhya*.

³ See Comp. Gr., s. 427, where this discrepancy between the Greek and Sans. is particularly noticed. There is, I think, however, an error of some consequence in the English translation of the first sentence of the paragraph in question.

coalesced immediately with the passive sign, there would be no occasion for altering the vowel, and we should have accordingly the orthography of *akunauyatá*.

The only remaining term is *akutá*, which, as I have already observed, I consider to be the 3rd pers. sing. middle imperf. of the same root, but conjugated in the second or seventh class, where the personal ending is either added immediately to the base, or the *u*, being interposed before a light termination, would be elided in combination with the Cuneiform dental¹. The respective employment of the active and middle voice appears in general to be as arbitrary in the old Persian as it is in Sanskrit², and in this particular instance, where we perceive the distinction between a transitive and reflective sense, I am inclined therefore to attribute it to a change of conjugation, rather than to a discrimination between the powers of the *paramáipadam* and *atmanépadam* forms; *akutá* seems to signify "he acted," the fruit of the action reverting to the agent; while in all the other forms, the verb governs an accusative case, and the action which it indicates passes over to the object.

𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠 KUGANAKÁ, [Col. II., l. 9, p. 215.] *Cyganaca*. The name of a Persian town which was probably near the Susian frontier, (as it was the native place of a chief who aspired to the independent government of the latter province,) but the position of which I am altogether unable to illustrate, either from ancient or modern geography.

𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠𐎧𐎺𐎠

KUR-USH, [Insc. No. 1, p. 270.] *Cyrus*.

KUR-AUSH, [Col. I., l. 28, p. 200, l. 39, p. 201, l. 53, p. 204, &c.,] *Cyri*.

This is the true vernacular reading of the name of the Great Cyrus, which in Hebrew was written כִּיֹּרֶשׁ or כִּיֹּרֶשׁ, and in Greek *Kūpos* or *Koūpos*. I have hitherto been content to accept

¹ I suggest the seventh class, as I am loth to believe that the nasal can be ever entirely lost in the conjugation of the root *ku*.

² *Akun(a)vatá* in the middle voice is thus used with the same transitive power as *akun(a)va* in the active voice, and the two forms also of *agarbáya* and *agarbáyatá* are employed indifferently.

the etymology, to which currency was given by a contemporary Greek¹, and comparing the name accordingly with the Sans. कुरु, Zend 𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬌 *hvarē*, and Pers. خور *khur*, I have even ventured from the change of the initial to draw an inference regarding the orthographical degradation of the Persian language in that early age².

Consequent, however, on the discovery that the letters 𐬕 and 𐬌 present the same alphabetical power, I am constrained to abandon the identification of Ctesias; for the guttural does not I believe in any example throughout the inscriptions represent the Devanagari sibilant³. I now compare *Kurush* with the Sanskrit कुरुः, which was probably a popular title among the Arian race before the separation of the Median and Persian branches⁴, and I support the illustration by remarking, that the rivers of Georgia and Persis, which we know in antiquity to have been distinguished by the royal title of *Kūpos*, still retain the old pronunciation in the modern orthography of کُر *Kur*⁵. It would be a curious though unprofitable enquiry to investigate the reasons which induced the compilers of the Zend Avesta, to disfigure the name of the great national hero of Persia, under the artificial form of 𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬌 *Huṣṣraua*, from whence we have the modern

¹ Καὶ τίθεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου Κύρον. Ctesias in Phot. Biblioth., col. 125. The same etymology is repeated by Plutarch in Vit. Artaxerxis; by the author of the Etym. Mag. in voce Κόπος, and by Plethon in his Commentary on the Zoroastrian Oracles; and Lassen adopts it in his Memoir, Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 154.

² See the observations on the letter 𐬌 in the Chapter on the Alphabet, p. 91.

³ That there was an interchange between the guttural and sibilant in Babylonian is certain, for *Nabokodrossor* is as often written with the *s* as the *k*, and the same change of course is found in comparing modern Persian with the Sanskrit, but I think that the language of the inscriptions uniformly represents क by 'uva.

⁴ The *Kuru* race of ancient India, descended from the famous कुरुः, the son of *Samvarana*, is too well known to require notice.

⁵ Strabo, lib. XV., p. 501, expressly says, that the Persian river *Kūpos* derived its name from the king, "Ὁὐ μετέβαλε τὸ ὄνομα ὁ βασιλεὺς."

خسرو *Khusrú*¹. That name is, I believe, to be first found in the geographical title of 'Οσρονηή or 'Οσδρονή, and it may be presumed, therefore, to have been borrowed from a Parthian Satrap², but unless from some fancied resemblance in sound and application to the person of Cyrus, I am utterly unable to understand how, in the time of the first Sassanians, it should have attained the popular pre-eminence which distinguishes it in the pages of the Zend Avesta, and which from that source has descended to it in all subsequent history. I will only add, that the absolute identity of the Sanskrit, Hebrew, Greek, Persian, Median, and Babylonian orthographies of the name confirm in the most satisfactory manner its true and primitive form.

The genitive form of *Kuraush*, which occurs repeatedly at Behistun, is extremely valuable in showing the respective employment of the letter ><< in combination with *u*, and the letter >| with *a*, as well as in connecting the case-endings of the old Persian with those of the Sanskrit, the Lithuanian, and the Gothic, in all of which, themes in *i* and *u* take the *guna* before the genitive sign *s*³. The *aus*, in fact, of the language of the inscriptions is exactly identical with the Sans. genitival अतो: *os*, the Lithuanian *aùs*, and the Gothic *aus*, and it may moreover be compared with the Latin *ús* in the fourth declension, where the elongation takes the place of the *guna*, and also with the >|ξ *èus*, of the Zend⁴, where the *guna* forms a distinct diphthong in conjunction with an epenthetic *i*.

¹ The Zend *Huṣṛava* appears to have been taken immediately from the Sans.

सुस्रवः *Susravas*, who is mentioned in the *Purānas* as one of the *Prajāpatīs*, and who, according to Burnouf, plays a conspicuous part in the *Vedas*; but this does not in any way explain the application of the name to the popular hero of Persia. See Vish. Pur., p. 50, n. 2, and Burnouf's *Cun. Mem.*, p. 172. Burnouf, indeed, appears to doubt in the passage last quoted, if *Huṣṛava* can be intended to designate the great Cyrus.

² Procopius distinctly says that the Mesopotamian 'Οσρονηή was named after a certain king, 'Οσρόος, who reigned there. *De Bel. Pers.*, l. 1., c. 17. Now 'Οσρονηή is first mentioned in the campaign of Crassus, but the Parthian king 'Οσρόος was only contemporary with Trajan, and it cannot therefore have been from him that the province derived its name.

³ For an examination of these genitive endings, see Bopp's *Comp. Gr.*, ss. 185 and 186.

⁴ Burnouf has very successfully analyzed the Zend genitive of themes in *u*, in his *Commentary on the Yaçna*, pp. 90 and 156.

<<॥ kh.

<<॥ ॠ ॡ ॢ ॣ KSHATĀRAM, [Passim,] *Corona* or *Imperium*.

This word is of course to be compared with the Sans. क्षत्र, used to denote "the warrior caste," and with the Zend 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *khshathra*, which was employed in a more specific manner to designate "a king"; but its etymology is subject to some uncertainty, for खद् in Sanskrit merely signifies "to eat" or "divide," and the grammarians therefore have supposed a *Sautra* root of the same form, with the meaning of "protecting" or "defending". As however the Sanskrit *kshatra* is frequently written *chheta* in Pali¹, and as the tendency of the guttural and palatal to interchange is notorious, I cannot help suspecting that the primitive Sanskrit *kshad* has been corrupted into खद् *chhad*, which does actually exist in the classical language with the same signification of "covering" or "screening," and from which the *chhatra*, or "parasol," the symbol of royalty, is avowedly derived². The only question is whether the term may not have originally denoted "a crown," as *covering* the head, and whether its application may not have been subsequently transferred from the special to the general, both in regard to the regal or "crowned" class of India³, and to the word in Zend expressive of "royalty." On the one hand, there is I think reason to suspect that the Hebrew כְּתָר, whence the Gr. *κίραυς*, may represent the Persian *khshatram*⁴, and as kings are in many languages

¹ *Khshathra*, "a king," occurs repeatedly in the Zend Avesta, and the meaning is considered by Burnouf to be determinately established; see Yaçna, &c., p. 151, &c., &c.

² See Westergaard's *Rad. Ling. Sans.*, pp. 161 and 333. Also, Wilson in *voce*, and Lassen's *Memoir in the Zeitschrift*, &c., p. 18.

³ *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.*, vol. VII., p. 564.

⁴ I am afraid to connect *chhatra* immediately with *khshatram*, although they may both etymologically signify "a royal covering."

⁵ The term, indeed, was no doubt used long before the introduction of caste; comp. the ethnic names *Σαρπαῖδαι*, *Ὀξυδράκαι*, &c.

⁶ The repugnance of the Semites to the compound Arian articulations was notorious, and *khsh* would naturally be contracted to a simple guttural; the כְּתָר

termed "crown bearers¹," while I am not aware that the term denoting "a crown," or any other emblem of royalty, is ever derived from a root conveying the abstract idea of "ruling," we might perhaps infer "a covering for the head," to be the primary signification of the Cuneiform term. On the other hand, the Sanskrit *kshatra*, and Zend *khshathra*, have every appearance of being derived immediately from *kshad* or *chhad*, "to screen or defend (the people)²"; and Rosen, moreover, from the Vedas, gives an abstract noun *kshatram*, with the signification of "strength," which he compares with the Greek *κράτος*³, and which in form is absolutely identical with the *khshatrām* of the inscriptions. Leaving it doubtful, therefore, which may be the original, and which the secondary signification, I have rendered the term by "crown" or "empire" throughout the translations, according as may be most agreeable to the English idiom⁴. I have only to add, that *khshatrām* is used in the inscriptions as a neuter noun of the first declension, and that it thus indifferently represents the nominative and accusative case.

𐎧𐎠𐎶 𐎠𐎶 𐎧𐎠𐎶 𐎧𐎠𐎶 𐎧𐎠𐎶 𐎧𐎠𐎶 KSHATRĀPĀ-VĀ, [Col. III., l. 14, p. 230, and l. 55, p. 235,] *Satrapesque*. The occurrence of this word in the inscriptions renders useless all further speculation as to the etymology and meaning of the word *Satrap*⁵. The verbal

of Esther, moreover, refers particularly to the Persian "crown;" see Gesenius in *voce*. The word, moreover, is generally derived from כָּתַר, "to surround," the *kirapis* being a "diadem" or "cincture."

¹ Comp. Arm. 𐎧𐎠𐎶𐎠𐎶 (Ind. *Thakore*?) lit. *Táj áwar*, "crown bearing." *Táj* is of Semitic origin.

² *Khshathrát* is also used in Zend with the meaning of "empire," and Burnouf says that *kshatra* has frequently the same signification in the Vedas, so that on the whole, no doubt, "imperium" is the best translation for the Cun. *khshatrām*. See Journ. Asiatique, Sér. IV., tom. IV., No. 20, p. 479.

³ See Rig Vedæ Spec., Notes, p. xi.

⁴ I rather think that we have *khshatra*, "a king," in the last word *σάρπα* of the famous Persian verse in Aristophanes—"Ἰάπρᾱ μὰν ἑαρέξαν ἀνίσσονται σάρπα," Acharn., Act I., Sc. 3, [see Mitchell's *Arist.*, vol. I., p. 27,] but I am not quite satisfied as to the meaning of the entire phrase.

⁵ This is a subject which has been much discussed; see Gesen. Heb. Lex., Eng. Ed., p. 41, for several fanciful derivations, De Sacy's being the only one which is near the truth. Sir J. Malcolm compares *chhatrapa*, "the holder of the parasol," and Anquetil suggests the etymology of *Satar-pai* سترپای, "below

affix which is added to *kshatrā* is identical with the Sans. पद् *pá*, whence پاس *pas*, پان *pán*, &c., in Persian, and the compound therefore signifies either "preserving the empire," or "preserving the crown." In the only two passages where the term is found, the copulative conjunction *vá*, answering to the Sans. व, and allied of course with the Semitic ו, is added to the nom. of the noun to connect the phrase that is attached to it with the preceding clause. *Kshatrāpā* is probably declined like a theme in long *a* of the first declension.

The change of the initial sound which is observable in the Hebrew אֶשְׁרֵיפָנִים, is nothing more than might be expected from the impossibility of adapting to the Semitic organs of speech the articulation of the Arian *ksh*, as a single power¹; but I am somewhat at a loss to understand the origin and application of the terminal *n*, although I perceive traces of the same (euphonic?) ending in the corrupted Median orthography of *shagshapāwanm*. In the Arian dialects, certainly, the suffix was preserved in its pure form, as we may assure ourselves by comparing the Cuneiform term with the *Kshatrāpā* of *Rudra Dama's* inscription at the Girnar Bridge, and upon the Saurashtran coins of the same family².

The Satraps were, as it is well known, originally the Governors or Viceroyes of the large provinces of the Persian empire, but the title in later times appears to have been equally adopted

the star." *Mém. de l'Acad.*, tom. LVI., p. 291, (12mo. Edit.) Hyde, again, (de Rel. Vet. Pers., p. 325,) would fain refer the title to استرپان, lit. "mule-keeper," supposed to have been adopted as an honorary epithet by the great officers of the State. While Prinsep, (*Asiat. Journ. Bengal*, vol. VII., p. 345,) and Wilson, (*Arian. Ant.*, p. 405,) relying on the exclusive application of the Sanskrit पद्म, render the Saurashtran title by "protector of the Kshatriyas," or "patron of the warrior class." I differ from De Sacy's explanation merely in referring the suffix immediately to the Sans. पद्, rather than to the modern Pers. corruption پان *pán*. See *Mém. de l'Inst.*, Classe d'Histoire, &c., II., p. 229.

¹ The Hebrew word occurs in Esther iii. 12, viii. 9, and ix. 3; and its Chaldee correspondent in Dan. iii. 2, 3 and 27, vi. 2 and 3.

² See the Coin Legends in the *Journ. Asiat. Soc. of Bengal*, vol. VI., p. 382, and vol. VII., p. 345.

by those who exercised independent royal functions. In the mutilated Greek Inscription at Behistun, the great Parthian king Gotargēs is thus content to name himself "Satrap of Satraps," (ΣΑΤΡΑΠΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΤΡΑΠ - - - - -), and throughout the whole series of the coins of the Saurashtran dynasty the titles of Raja and Kshatrāpa are applied to the same individual. I have never met with the term in Arabic or Persian works*, and I greatly doubt if it was employed in Persia subsequent to the rise of the Sassanians.

𐎧𐎡𐎹 𐎠𐎧𐎡𐎹 𐎧𐎡𐎹 𐎧𐎡𐎹 𐎧𐎡𐎹 KSHATHRITA, [Col. II., l. 15, p. 216, &c.,] *Xathrites*. A name which is evidently of kindred etymology with *khshatrām*, but in which I am altogether unable to explain the reason of the substitution of 𐎧𐎡𐎹 for 𐎧𐎡𐎹, for the latter character will coalesce with the *i*, as in *Atřina*, *Atřiyātiya*, &c., as well as with the *a*. In pronunciation, we can of course readily distinguish between the *tř*, where the *r* was almost dormant, and the *thr*, where the dental combining with the liquid in its full force underwent aspiration; but I confess I do not understand the etymological reason of the distinction in the derivatives from *khshad*. The name would appear to have belonged to the son or next heir of Astyages, as it was assumed by an impostor Phraortes, who sought in the time of Darius to re-establish the independence of the Medes¹; but there is certainly no such individual mentioned in Grecian history, nor have I met with the name applied to any other chieftain. I should translate *khshathrita*, "who has obtained the empire" (or "crown,") comparing the termination with the Sanskrit participle, ३३⁴.

¹ See Journ. Royal Geograph. Soc., vol. IX., p. 114. There is also a copy of this fragmentary legend in Hoeck's *Vet. Med. et Pers. Mon.*, p. 141, which must have been taken by Grelôt, who accompanied Bembo in his Persian tour not many years after the old tablet was destroyed to make room for the Arabic inscription. Bembo's visit was in 1673, and the Arabic tablet is dated A.H. 1026.

² I do not regard the 𐎧𐎡𐎹 of the Lexicons, as that term has been evidently foisted in through the Arabic from the Greek.

³ This Median revolt will be further noticed under the head of *Fravartish*.

⁴ The true reading, however, may perhaps be *Khshathraitā*, the name being formed in the same manner as the Zend *khshaitā*, "a king."

𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎠𐎹 𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎧𐎡𐎴 KHSHAPA-VÁ, [Col. I., l. 20, p. 198,] *Nocte-que*. This word occurs in the phrase, *khshapavá rauchapativá*, "both by night and by day," the postposition *paii*, (for 𐎧𐎡𐎴 or 𐎧𐎡𐎴 *paii*), governing both the nouns in the accus. case, and the copulative conjunction *vá* being appended, in one place immediately to the noun, and in the other to the governing particle. It follows, therefore, that the true forms must be *khshapamvá* and *rauchampativá*; and it is this example of the elision of the nasal before the semi-vowel *v* which, among other considerations, has induced me to interpose an *a* in the groupe 𐎧𐎡𐎴 that occurs so frequently in the verbal formations of the fifth class. The nom. *khshapa* answers to the Sans. क्षपा, the Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀 *khshapó*¹ and Persian شب *shab*; and according to Rosen, it may also be compared with the Latin "*crepusculum*."

𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎠𐎹 𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎧𐎡𐎴 KHSHANÁSÁTIYA, [Col. I., l. 52, p. 204.] *Cognoscat*. I consider the Cuneiform *khshanás* to connect the Greek γνῶσ-κω, (Lat. *gnos-co*), with the Pers. شناس *shinás*, the guttural being preserved in one form and the sibilant in the other; but I doubt if the Sans. क्षा, which is usually compared with the Greek verb, can be of cognate origin².

¹ I have never met with the Zend nom. sing., but I have *khshafna* in the nom. plur., and *khshafné* in the loc. sing., while the abl. sing. is *khshaparát*; so that the theme evidently follows the declension of the Sans. अहन्, which has अह् in the nom. for अहर, and which uses the *r* in all its compounds. As a further proof that the nouns are declined alike, compare the Zend locatives *paii acné*, *paii khshafné*, and consult Bopp, Comp. Gr., s. 40, and Yaçna, p. 34. I consider this evidence of the interchange of the *n* and *r* to be of much orthographical value.

² See Rig Vedæ Spec. Adnotat., p. xi.

³ क्षा altered to क्षा, as it is in all the special tenses, has with the suffix of the ninth class produced the Pers. دان *dán*; *khshanás* and γνῶσ must, on the other hand, I think, be compound roots, but I know not the elements. Schneider's explanation, *vós*, γνῶσ, and by reduplication γγνῶσ, cannot at any rate be admitted.

In the Median form, which I read *Aksahasha* or *Aksahassa*, the *r* has given way to a cognate aspirate, and in the Babylonian orthography, which I doubtfully give as *Ah(a)shhárasha* or *Ah(a)shharashhá*, these aspirations are so formidably multiplied as almost to impede pronunciation. Of all the various forms that have been yet discovered, the hieroglyphic *Khshharsha* upon the Vase of Caylus approaches nearest to the true orthography¹. As we have no example in the inscriptions of the name of Xerxes in the gen. case, it must be doubtful whether the noun follow the first declension in long *a*, or whether it may not rather be of the twelfth class of the eighth declension of Wilkins.

If we may credit the lists of Assyrian kings preserved by the chronologers, the royal name of Xerxes had been adopted on the banks of the Tigris in the very remotest antiquity², and this is the more remarkable as the etymology is certainly Arian. After the time of the Achæmenians, however, it appears to have fallen entirely into disuse. Neither is it employed in the Parthian nomenclature, nor has it survived under a corrupted form in the Zend Avesta, or in Persian romance. There was an Armenian province of *Ξερξηνή*, named from the king³. There is also a town of *Drangiana*, mentioned by Ptolemy under the name of *Ξαφιάνη*⁴, and it is possible that the royal title of *شهر* *Shár*, which belonged to the kings of the Persian colony of *Ghurjestán*, established in the Paropamisian mountains⁵, may preserve a trace of the ancient designation, but I have never met with any other name which could be conjecturally referred to it⁶.

taxerxes (Mnemon), is perfectly consistent with history, and fixes the Exodus of Ezra in B.C. 398, and that of Nehemiah in B.C. 385, (instead of in 458 and 445), the colonies, in fact, leaving Babylonia under Artaxerxes Mnemon, and not under Artaxerxes Longimanus.

¹ See Heeren's Researches, vol. II., p. 340.

² See the several Lists in Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, vol. II., p. 267.

³ Strabo, p. 364, and Stephen. *in voce*.

⁴ Lib. VI., c. 19.

⁵ De Sacy published a Memoir on this colony in the Mines de l'Orient, vol. I., p. 321.

⁶ That Gesenius (*in voce*) should pretend to compare *אחשורוש* with *شیرشاه*, "Lion King," is a proof that the study of Persian comparative philology is still in its infancy.

both the βασιλεὺς of the Greeks, and the *Rāja* of India¹; but their native epithet appears to have been that of *Terkhán*, which is in use among the Turkish tribes to the present day². I know not indeed of any employment of the ancient title under the Arsacide empire, except in the *Zaḥos* of the coins of Kadaphes, who reigned in Cabul, about B.C. 120³. Under the Sassanians, with the revival of Persian habits and institutions, the appellation was partially resumed, but it came in apparently from the East; while the Semitic *Malká*⁴ continued to hold its place on the coins and in the royal inscriptions until a late period of the dynasty. The title certainly occurs in the name of *Shahpuhri* (Sapor), as well as in the territorial epithets of *Σαγασσά* and *Κερμασά*, assumed respectively by Bahram III. and Bahram IV.⁵, and it is, I think, even to be recognized in the Pehlevi Inscriptions of the second and third *Shapúr*, at *Kermánsháh*, (where, however, 𐭮𐭲𐭩𐭥 has been hitherto read *Vohid* instead of *Shahyd*⁶.) It must have been well known at the same time in the extreme East, to have given rise to the distinctive epithet of *Sháhishahán*, applied to the King of Persia in the Gupta Inscription of the sixth century, upon the pillar at Allahabád⁷, and that it had come into general use also in Persia among the later Sassanians, is shown by the title of *Σαδασαδάρᾱχ*, which is assumed by Siroes,

¹ See the coins of Gondophares, Arsaces, Pacorus, &c., in Cunningham's Plates, No. 14 and 15, and Wilson's Ar. Ant., Plate V. I have also seen coins of Orodes with the same Indian legend.

² Περσιστὶ δὲ Τορκιμ βασιλεὺς ἐρμενεύεται. John of Malala, Ed. Dindorf., p. 270. The title of *Terkhán* is now given among the Uzbeqs to the heir-apparent; but in the lists of *Ibn Khurdádbeh* and *Abu Rihán*, it is stated to belong to the king himself.

³ In giving this date, I follow Lassen with some hesitation. See Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, vol. IX., p. 765.

⁴ The Semitic *Malká* is also found in the Parthian transcripts of the records of the early Sassanians, and was thus probably in use in the West under the later Arsacides. I think even it may be read on the Perso-Scythic coins of Cabul, of the sixth and seventh century, upon which the concluding epithet appears to be *Hurasán Malká*, "king of Khorassan." See Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, vol. VII., Pl. XXII.

⁵ Agathias, lib. IV. c. 24, says distinctly that *Σαγασσά* signified in Greek, *Σεγαστανῶν βασιλεὺς*, and he refers to the same explanation in noticing the title of *Κερμασά*, in the 26th chapter of the same book.

⁶ Even in the last critique upon these inscriptions in the Journ. Asiatique for January, 1843, the old reading of *Vohia* is still retained, but it is extremely doubtful if such a term was ever in use in Pehlevi.

⁷ See Prinsep's remarks in the Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, vol. VI., p. 974.

in his letter to Heraclius¹. I have not yet been able to satisfy myself of the reading of the Sassanian coins of this age, but the *Malká* of the earlier series has certainly disappeared, and I think that the title has been replaced both by *Khzata* (the *zāda* of Siroes,) and *Huta* (for خدا²). After the rise of Islam, the old term continued to be extensively used in the eastern portions of the Persian empire. In a very curious list of royal synonyms, which was I believe first published by *Ibn Khurdádbeh* in about A.H. 280, and which was afterwards re-arranged and tabulated by the famous *Abú Rihán* in about A.H. 420³, it is applied under different forms to the Kings of *Cábúl*, of *Khárizm*, of *Sughd*, of *Ferghánah*, of *Termid*, of *Khatl*, of *Bámíán*, and other neighbouring countries, and the *Sháh Náme* of *Firdousi* is alone sufficient to establish that in that age the particular applicability of the title to the monarchs of Persia was universally admitted; but still I am doubtful if it ever regained its proper and legitimate pre-eminence in the country in which it originated until the rise of the Suffavean dynasty⁴. At present, as we know, the King of Persia is termed the *Shah* شاه, "par excellence," and his paramount epithet of شاهنشاه *Shahinshah* nearly reproduces the *khsháyathiyánám khsháyathiya* of the inscriptions⁵.

¹ Paschal. Chronicle; Ed. Dindorf., vol. I., p. 735. Ammianus Marcellinus, also, applies the exact title of *Saansaa* to the Persian kings, but I cannot now refer to the passage.

² These coins are figured in Marsden's Num. Orient., vol. II., Pl. XXIX., and in Longperrier's Mem., Pl. X., XI., and XII., and I believe that the legends have been pretty satisfactorily deciphered by Dr. Olshausen of Copenhagen. I have in my own cabinet, however, several new and perfect varieties that have never, I think, been published. *Khodá*, now used for "God," was the royal title of the ancient kings of *Bokhara* and *Guzagán*.

³ I quote *Ibn Khurdádbeh*, after a copy taken by Dr. Sprenger from the unique MS. in the Bodl., No. 993. *Abú Rihán's Hadikat ul Ahbáb* حديقة الاحباب, a most excellent work on Chronology and Astronomy, is in my own library.

⁴ In India, the title of *Sháh* was commonly used from the first establishment of the Patan sovereigns, in the sixth century of the Hejrah; but in contemporaneous Persian numismatology it is, I believe, unknown, except as a proper name. In the oldest Persian written works, however, the titles both of *Sháh* and *Pádsháh* (*Pád* being the Pehlevi *Pad*, Sans. पति *pati*), are frequently found; and D'Herbelot says that the Boides assumed the title of *Sháhinsháh* in the fourth century of the Hejrah.

⁵ For a collection of all the ancient authorities regarding the title of "king of

The Cuneiform noun is regularly declined as a masc. of the first declension in short *a*, the terminations in *a*, *am*, *ahya*, *d*, and *ánám*, answering respectively to the Sanskrit endings in *अः*, *अं*, *अस्य*, *आः*, and *आनां*. Bopp observes of the gen. plur., that the true inflexion is *आन्*¹, and that the *n* which precedes it, both in Sanskrit and in Zend, is euphonic; but this does not explain the lengthening of the vowel of the base in the former language, and I am inclined, therefore, to see in the syllable *an*, which interposes between the base and the case-ending, the pristine plural characteristic to which I have more than once alluded, and the existence of which, if established, will form an important link between the languages of the Arian and Semitic family.

𐎧𐎡𐎴 g.

𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎡𐎴 𐎡𐎴 𐎡𐎴 GADÁRA, [Ins. No. 4, l. 18, p. 280, and No. 6, l. 24, 25, p. 294.] *Gandara*. For the ancient illustration of this name, which was equally well known in Sanskrit history as *गन्धार*, and among the Greeks under the forms of *Γανδαπίρις*² *Γανδαπυρις*, &c., it may be sufficient to refer to the elaborate commentaries of Wilson, Troyer, and Lassen³; but I cannot avoid adding a few remarks on the application of the title in

kings," assumed by the Persian monarchs, see Brisson, de Reg. Pers. Princ., p. 4. sqq. In *Sháhinsáh* we have the Chaldee plur. 𐎧𐎡𐎴𐎡𐎴, which was also used in Parthian, instead of the Pehlevi *Malkán*.

¹ See Comp. Gr., ss. 245 and 246; Bopp, however, observes that the euphonic interposition appears to be pristine, since the Zend partakes of it; and he admits the connexion of the accus. ending in *आन्* with the plur. 𐎡𐎴 *án*, of the modern Persian.

² Professor Wilson's remarks on the Gandháras are contained in the *Asiat. Res.*, vol. XV. p. 103; in his *Arian. Ant.*, p. 131, &c., and in his admirable translation of the *Vishnu Purana*, pp. 191 and 443. For Captain Troyer's Notes on the same subject, see his edition of the *Rája Tarangini*, tom. II., p. 316, &c., and Lassen's arguments are given in the *Pentapot.*, p. 15; in his *Ind. Alterthumsk.*, p. 422, and in his *Memoir on Bactrian history*, (translated in the *Asiat. Journ. Bengal*, vol. IX., Part I., p. 473, sqq.) The Sanskrit authorities embrace every ancient work of any note; among the Greeks who mention the name we have Hecateus, Herodotus, Strabo, Dionysius, and Ptolemy, and the Chinese notices which are most ample occur in the respective travels of *Fá Hian*, of *Soung yun*, and of *Hiuan Tsang*. See *Foé Koué Ki*, pp. 66, 353, and 379.

more recent times. The Gadara of the inscriptions is no doubt identified with that of the Greeks and Hindus, and refers to the country along the banks of the Indus, and its tributaries as they descend from the mountains. The question then arises if there be any connexion between this title and the modern *Candahár* (قندهار). Wilson and Troyer are of opinion that the country of the *Gandhāras* may have extended from the Indus to the vicinity of the Helمند; while Lassen, on the contrary, holds the two *Candahārs* to be entirely distinct, and sees in the Western settlement an extraordinary instance of the migration of a name. The inquiries, however, which have been hitherto instituted and which give these results, depend entirely on Greek, Sanskrit, and Chinese authorities, descending no lower than the era of Islām, and I propose therefore to add something from the Arabs. In Eastern geography we have ample and repeated notices of *Candahár*, and, with one exception which I shall presently mention, the name invariably applies to the country on the Indus until comparatively modern times. I may quote in chronological succession, *Beládhori*, *Mass'oudi*, *Abú Rihán*, *Edrisi*, and *Abulfedá*, to show that *Sindhu Gandhāra* retained its ancient title, as low at any rate as the sixth or seventh century of the Hejrah¹, and I may add, that during the same period Arachosia, with its successive capitals of *Penjwái* and *Tanganábád* would appear to have entirely lost the designation². That the name of *Candahár*, however, was actually borne by the city on the *Arghandáb* soon after the institution of Islām, is proved by the account preserved of the first Arab invasion of the country in about A.H. 55³, and

¹ Candahar on the Indus was taken by the Arabs, who ascended the river in boats, under the Caliph Mansoor, about A.H. 145. See Reinaud's *Frag.*, (Beladh.) p. 179. It is noticed by Mass'oudi (Sprenger's Ed.), pp. 234 and 381. Abú Rihán gives the position of Vihund (modern Hound or Uhúnd,) the capital of Candahár, on the west bank of the Indus, fifteen farsakhs from Peshawar; (see Reinaud's *Frag.*, p. 88.) Edrisi's account, p. 182, is probably from Ibn Haukal, but Jau- bert's translation is always suspicious; and Abulfedá, (p. 357, Ar. Text,) in his notice of Vihund, appears to follow Abú Rihán. I here merely quote printed authorities, but in manuscript works the indication is even still more clear.

² The ruins of Penjwái are still to be seen about eighteen miles south-west of the modern town of Candahár, but I am doubtful about the site of Tanganábád.

³ All the geographers and historians from Ibn Khurdábeh to Abulfedá, describe ^{الرخج} *Arrakhaj*, (Arachosia,) and Penjwái, but Yákút alone in the *Mo'ejem el Baldán*, applies to the same place the name of Candahár. He follows Beládhori word for word, and describes the march of 'Obád Ibn Ziyád from the

we must suppose it therefore to have only temporarily fallen into disuse between that period and the rise of the Chenchizian kings.

I cannot pretend to explain with any certainty the cause of this assumption of the name, but I will offer a very probable conjecture. We are enabled from the Chinese authorities to trace in the sixth century of Christ the transport of the most holy relic of Buddhism, the famous water-pot of Fo, from the banks of the Indus to the frontiers of Persia, that is, from the eastern to the western *Gandhāra*. This remarkable transport must, I think, necessarily have been attended with a great popular emigration¹, for the *Gandhāras* regarded the relic as a sort of national palladium, and previous attempts at its removal by foreign but victorious powers had failed². They probably, as I think, were driven from their native seats by the incursions of the lesser *Yuē-chi*³, and carrying their treasured vessel with them, they founded a new settlement on the banks of the *Arghandāb*, and gave their name of course to the country of their adoption. I may add, that the pot of the *Gandhāras* is to be seen at the present day among the ruins of the town of *Candahār*, still retaining its holy and miraculous character, and thus affording one of the only traces that remain to us of the early fortunes of the province⁴.

Sinārud of Sejestan to Rudbār, then along the Helمند to Bost, and from thence across the Desert to Candahār, where he founded the town of 'Obādfeh. The passage in Reinaud's *Frag.*, p. 164, requires correction after Yākūt.

¹ The Pot of Fo was in Foē-leou-cha or Peshāwar, one of the chief cities of the *Gandhāras* of the Indus, when Fā Hian visited the place in about A.D. 403; but it could hardly have been there at the period of Soung yun's journey to the same city (he names it however, Foē-sha-fou) in about A.D. 503, or it would have been noticed by him. At any rate it had been removed to the Persian frontier some time before Hiuan Tsang's visit to Pa-lou-cha, (which is the same town of Peshāwar,) in about A.D. 635. I suppose the tyrant who ruled in *Gandhāra* at the period of Soung yun's journey, and who was not of the Buddhist faith, to have been king of the invading Yuē-chi, and I place therefore the great emigration of the *Gandhāra* tribe to the westward in about A.D. 480. Compare Foē Kouē Ki, pp. 76, 351, 355, and 356.

² Foē Kouē Ki, p. 76.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴ This pot has been inscribed with a modern Arabic legend, and was therefore little noticed by our Anglo-Indian antiquaries at Candahār, but it exactly answers the description given in Foē Kouē Ki, p. 32, from Chinese authorities; and on great occasions the Dervishes of Candahār are still regaled with sherbet at the public expense from the capacious bowl; it is believed, also, by the vulgar, that the *kashkul*, or "water-pot," as it is called, will contain any quantity of liquor without overflowing.

Gaddra, in the inscriptions, is used as the name of a country, but in Greek and Sanskrit it generally occurs as an ethnic title. Earlier migrations of the tribe may account for the position of the *Candari* of Pliny and Ptolemy, and the *Gandari* of Pomponius Mela, on the northern frontiers of Sogdiana, as well as for the town of *Râdap* in *Khorassân*¹, but as the name of *Gaddra* is always found in the Cuneiform geographical lists in conjunction with India, Sattagydia, or the Sacæ, we must certainly believe the body of the nation to have resided, in the time of Darius, between *Peshâwar* and *Cashmir*, and the expedition of Scylax, in which the monarch is known to have been greatly interested², will account perhaps for a petty district being thus prominently noticed, while several of the chief provinces of the empire are omitted in the enumeration of the Satrapies.

𐎠𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎶𐎵 GADUTAVA, [Col. III., l. 65, p. 236,]

Gadyta. A district on the western frontiers of Arachosia, which may possibly be represented by the modern *Kaddah* on the *Khâsh rûd*, conterminous with Seistân. I do not think the name occurs in ancient geography, but the place was well known to

the Arabs under the title of جَدَّة *Jaddah*³, and appears to have been of some consequence in the third and fourth centuries of the Hejrah. It is mentioned in the inscriptions as the scene of an action between the Satrap of Arachosia and a rebel force which had been detached from Persis, and which had rallied after their first defeat at *Kâpishkânish*.

𐎠𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎶𐎵 𐎠𐎶𐎵 GARB. This root, which may perhaps with more

propriety be written *Grab*, is identical with the Vedic गृ॒भ् *Gṛibh*, and may be compared with the Zend »𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀 *Gerev*; Pers. گریز *Girif*; Icelandic *Gripa*; Ger. *Graben*; Eng. *grip*, *gripe*, *grab*,

¹ Plin., lib. VI., c. 16; Ptol., lib. VI., c. 12; Pomp. Mel., lib. I., c. 2, and Isidore of Charax, p. 7.

² Herod., lib. IV., c. 44.

³ Jaubert, in his Translation (p. 445) of Edrisi, reads incorrectly جَرَّة *Jarrah* or *Jarrat*. The town is mentioned by all the geographers, and was visited by Captain E. Conolly in 1839.

&c.¹ In the inscriptions we have the following verbal formations:—

AGARBÁYAM, [Col. II., l. 4, p. 214,] *Cepi*.

AGARBÁYA, [Col. II., l. 88, p. 226, &c.,] *Cepit*.

AGARBÁYATÁ, [Col. I., lines 42 and 43, p. 201, &c.,] *Potitus est*.

AGARBÁYA(YA?)TÁ, [Col. II., l. 73, p. 223,] *Captus est*.

Verbs of the tenth class in the Vedic dialect frequently, I believe, elongate the vowel of conjunction between the conjugational suffix and the root, instead of changing the radical vowel as in Sanskrit. In regard to this verb, at any rate, the Vedic conjugation is exactly similar to that of the old Persian, for गृभ् in the former dialect regularly makes गृभायति, and we have thus गृभाय in the 2nd pers. sing. imperat., अगृभायत् in the 3rd pers. act. imperf., and गृभायत् (without the augment) in the 3rd pers. middle imperfect².

With the two latter forms, then, must be compared the Cuneiform *agarbáya* and *agarbáyatá*, the personal termination being elided in the one instance as a silent consonant, and in the other the final vowel being elongated. *Agarbáyatá*, as the 3rd pers. of the passive imperfect, is suspicious, for as we have seen the conjugational suffix to be retained in that voice in *akun(a)vayata*, we should expect to find *agarbáyayatá*, and the word being imperfect on the rock, that may very possibly, after all, be the true orthography³. On the other hand, the middle voice is certainly in some instances used with a passive sense, (compare *agarbatá*, "he was called,") and I therefore leave the reading in suspense⁴. I have written *garb* instead of *grab*, merely because the Cuneiform alphabet does not possess the Vedic गृ, but as the root

¹ The Latin *rap-ia*, Finnish *Rawi*, Persian *Row*, &c., appear to be all cognate forms, with the mere loss of the initial. For Burnouf's remarks on the Zend *gērēv*, *gērēpta*, &c., see Yaçna, p. 460.

² I find the imper. *grībhāya* in the Rig Veda, II. 91, s. 4. Rosen, also, gives the act imperf. *udagrībhāyat* from the Schol. to Panini, 3. 1. 84, and Westergaard quotes for the mid. imp. without the augment *grībhāyata*, vv. 104. 18. See Rig Ved. Spec., p. 186, and Adnot. to the same, p. 57. Westergaard's examples are in his Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 320.

³ See the Notes to the Text and translation of Col. II., l. 73.

⁴ It is possible, also, that the retention of the class suffix in the passive voice may not have been constant, and in that case *ya* would be the regular passive characteristic in *agarbáyatá*.

becomes **अह** in the classical Sanskrit, and as the lengthening of the conjunctive vowel in the old Persian renders unnecessary any modification of the radical letters, I am by no means satisfied that the latter is not the true reading¹. The verb in the inscriptions usually has the signification of "taking," as applied to "taking a city," "taking a man prisoner," &c., but in some instances it may be more appropriately rendered by "*potior*," "to obtain" or "to become possessed of," a sense which is not given by Wilson to the Sanskrit **अह**, but which appears from Westergaard to belong legitimately to the verb **अह**, as it is used in the Vedas². *Khahatram agarbáyatá* can thus only signify "he gained possession of the empire," [Col. I., l. 42, 43,] and, I agree with Lassen in translating *imá dahyáva tyá adam agarbáyam*, "these are the countries of which I have become master," the Median translation employing in the latter passage the same verb which usually answers to **अह**, "to possess."

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡𐽢𐽣𐽤𐽥𐽦𐽧𐽨𐽩𐽪𐽫𐽬𐽭𐽮𐽯𐽰𐽱𐽲𐽳𐽴𐽵𐽶𐽷𐽸𐽹𐽺𐽻𐽼𐽽𐽾𐽿𐾀𐾁𐾃𐾅𐾂𐾄𐾆𐾇𐾈𐾉𐾊𐾋𐾌𐾍𐾎𐾏𐾐𐾑𐾒𐾓𐾔𐾕𐾖𐾗𐾘𐾙𐾚𐾛𐾜𐾝𐾞𐾟

it reappears in the Pehlevi *Guobia*¹, "language," and either from it, or from a root गृ, which must have been of cognate origin, we have several English words, such as *gab*, *gabber*, *gibberish*, &c.²

The derivatives from *gub* which occur in the Inscriptions, are,—

GAUBAT(Δ)IYA, [Col. II., l. 21, p. 216, &c.,] *Dicitur—appellatur*.
AGAUBATÁ, [Col. I., l. 84, p. 211, &c.,] *Dictus, seu appellatus est*.

The latter form is the 3rd pers. sing. of the middle imperfect, but it is impossible to say from the orthography of the former (𐭪𐭣𐭣 coalescing equally with *a* and *i*), whether it may be the 3rd pers. sing. present of the active, or of the middle voice. As the verb however is in every instance used in a passive, or at any rate a reflective sense, (the best English translation being "to be called,") the conjugation is most probably restricted to the *átmanépadam* voice, and I give the optional reading accordingly of *taiya* for 𐭪𐭣𐭣 𐭣𐭣 𐭣𐭣 in the 3rd pers. sing. of the present, to reproduce the Sanskrit तै, *té*. I have only to add, that the Cuneiform verb follows the first instead of the tenth class, and that the employment of 𐭣𐭣, instead of 𐭣𐭣𐭣, to express the radical guttural, affords sufficient evidence of the introduction of the *guna*, the former character requiring, I think, the vowel *a* as a necessary adjunct³.

¹ I take this word from Anquetil, tom. II., p. 515, but no doubt the orthography is disfigured, and I have failed to discover the term in the *Bun Debeh*.

² *Gab* is I believe a gypsy word answering to the Hindustani *Gap* (گپ), which again may come either from गृ or गृ. *Gibberish*, also, has been compared with the Arab. جفر "*Jafr*," but with little show of probability; equally wild is Hyde's reference of the term to the Persian *Gabar* (گبار). See *de Rel. Vet. Pers.*, p. 364, where the extracts from the Talmud, however, regarding the *Gabars* of Persia, are certainly very curious in showing the extreme antiquity of the title.

³ The *guna*, as it is well known, is applied to the radical vowel of verbs of the first class in Sanskrit throughout the special tenses, both in the active and middle voice.

𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 GAUBRUVA, [Col. IV., l. 84, p. 257, and Col. V., l. 7, p. 258, &c.,] *Gobryas*. The name of one of the seven conspirators which has been preserved in the *ῥωβρύης* of Herodotus¹. We learn from the inscriptions, that the father of Gobryas was Mardonius, and Grecian history gives the same title to his son, the famous Persian commander under Darius and Xerxes who fell at Plataea²; so that in this case we have another example of an alternate series in the names of a family. Ctesias, indeed, appears to have been confounded with the sustained alternation, and names accordingly the conspirator Mardonius, instead of Gobryas³.

I conjecture that the term etymologically signified "a speaker," being derived from *गो*, "speech," and *ब्रु*, "to say," and as an additional proof that the first syllable of the name is *Gau* rather than *Gu*, I may refer to the Greek orthography of *ῥω*, instead of *rov* or *ro*. Herodotus terms Gobryas one of the noblest of the Persians, and further informs us that he married a sister of Darius⁴. In the inscriptions, besides being mentioned among the conspirators, he appears as the leader of an expedition against the rebels of Susiana, and was no doubt, therefore, one of the most confidential officers of the Court.

𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀 𐬔𐬀

GAUMÁT-A, [Col. I., l. 36, p. 201, &c.,] *Gomatus*.

GAUMÁT-AM, [Col. I., l. 49, 50, p. 204, &c.,] *Gomatum*.

In this word we have the true orthography of the name of the Magian impostor⁵, who personated the son of Cyrus, after the

¹ The name of Gobryas is mutilated in the list of the conspirators on the Persian tablet, but can be restored from the Median copy, where we have *Gupava*. In the fifth supplementary column, also, the Persian orthography is complete.

² Herod., lib. VII., c. 82; lib. IX., c. 63, &c.

³ See Phot. Biblioth., p. 114.

⁴ I prefer this etymology to that of "the cherisher of herds," for if we have a noun of agency from *𐬔𐬀*, the nom. would be *Gaubarush*; the *v* in *Gaubruva* is euphonic to connect *u* and *a*; *bru*, "to speak," in Zend becomes *mru*.

⁵ Lib. III., c. 70; and Lib. VII., c. 5.

⁶ I may observe, also, that the Median and Babylonian orthographies of the name correspond as nearly as possible with the Persian; the only difference, indeed, arises from the confusion of *m* and *v*.

death of Cambyzes, and who is known in history as Smerdis Magus. I am not quite satisfied of the etymology of the name, but I imagine it must be equivalent to the Sans. गोमन्, "possessing herds;" the vowel of the affix being irregularly lengthened¹. In nothing is the Behistun Inscription more valuable than in the brief, but authentic account which it contains of the Magian usurpation, a period of history that has been strangely disfigured by Grecian annalists. Herodotus, is, perhaps, the nearest to the truth in his general account of the rebellion, but he falls into the extraordinary error of associating two brothers in the imposition, and he appears moreover to have been ignorant of the name of *Gomatus*². Ctesias³ again substitutes a Zend title, Σφερδαδάτης, *Spēñtadāta*, "given to the holy one⁴," for the proper name *Gaumāta*, and he is certainly wrong in supposing the Magian to have adopted the character of the son of Cyrus with the knowledge and approval of Cambyzes; while Trogus Pompeius (who has, however, alone preserved the vernacular title of the impostor,) gives a still more distorted account of the transaction, and describes the Magian conspiracy and the murder of Smerdis, as occurring subsequently to the death of his elder brother⁵. We may hardly quarrel with Herodotus and Æschylus for giving to the Magus the names of Σμέρδης and Μάρδος, for he was no doubt generally known by the fictitious title of *Bardiya* which he had assumed⁶; but I am quite at a loss to explain the

¹ I prefer this explanation to a comparison of the name with गोमन्, for the nom. of that form would be गोमान्, the affix in मन् appears to be exactly the Persian مند *mand*.

² He says indeed, expressly, (lib. III., c. 61,) that the Magian's own name was Smerdis, a circumstance which he seems to think assisted in the imposture, though it is not easy to see how.

³ For the account which Ctesias gives of the usurpation, see Phot. Bib., p. 112 and 113, Ed. Schott.

⁴ *Spēñta*, which is the Lithuanian *sventa*, and I suspect the Latin *sanctus*, occurs in the name of *Spentamán*, the ancestor of Zoroaster. Compare also the name of the Sogdian chief Σιραμένης; and see Yaqna, p. 173.

⁵ For the account of Trogus Pompeius, see Justin, l. I., c. 9. This historian agrees in many circumstances with Herodotus, but still there is sufficient difference in the two accounts to show that he must have had access to independent authorities.

⁶ The various orthographies of this name will be examined under the head of *Bardiya*.

origin of the story of the two brothers, not a trace of which is to be found in the record of Darius; and I am equally perplexed to account for the *Παρυσιθής* of Herodotus, or to understand how Trogus Pompeius, who was acquainted with the name of *Cometes*¹, should nevertheless have transferred the impersonation of the son of Cyrus to an imaginary confederate, *Oropas'es*. The most singular hallucination, however, under which the Greeks laboured, and which Plato shared with Herodotus², was that the usurpation of the Magus was an attempt at the re-establishment of the Medes³; whereas, to all appearance the impostor was a native Persian⁴. His cause, at any rate, was first adopted in Persis, where affairs probably had become disorganized in consequence of the long continued absence of Cambyses, and it is stated by Darius as a matter of surprise, that "neither Persian, nor a Median, nor even one of the Achemenidæ, opposed him⁵." Further illustration I shall reserve for the chapter that I devote to history.

𐬔𐬀 𐬀𐬎 𐬔𐬀 𐬀𐬎 GAUSHÁ, [Col. II., l. 74, p. 223, and l. 89, p. 226,]

Aures. The accusative plural of a noun in short *a* of the first declension, which is identical with the Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 or 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *gausha*⁶, and the Persian گوش *gush*, and which, derived from the root 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬀, "to emit a sound," is cognate with the abstract noun 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬀, "voice" or "sound." Burnouf not only considers the Gothic *haus-jan*, "to hear," and *aus-ô*, "an ear," together with the Greek *oûs*, (and I may add, the Latin *aus-culto*), to correspond etymologically, but also by the change of the *s* into

¹ The *Cometes* (I believe *Comates* is found in some MSS.) of Justin, is the *Patizithes* of Herodotus, and *Oropastes* represents *Smerdis*.

² See Herod., lib. III., cc. 65, 73, &c.; and Plato, *Op. II.*, p. 695.

³ Heeren assumes this as an established fact, on the authority of Herodotus and Plato. See *Researches*, &c., (Eng. Ed.), vol. I., p. 346.

⁴ It cannot be proved that *Pishiyá'u-vádáyá*, the native country of the Magian, was in Persis; but it may be assumed with a very strong degree of probability. See hereafter *in voce*.

⁵ Compare throughout the 11th, 12th, and 13th paras. of Col. I. at Behistun.

⁶ The indifferent employment of 𐬔𐬀 and 𐬔𐬀𐬎 in this word affords, I think, another proof that they both represent the aspirated sibilant. Nevertheless, in writing Zend words in the Roman character, I usually follow Burnouf's system of orthography.

r, he compares the Latin *auris*, Germ. *horen*, *ohr*, (and of course all the European forms, *or-eille*, *hear*, *ear*, &c.,) and by a further strengthening of the *r* into *d*, he includes even *aud-io*, *ér-és*, &c.¹ If this extensive comparison be admitted, the Semitic forms will likewise come into the catalogue; for we can hardly doubt of the connexion of *aud-io* with the Chaldean 𐤀𐤅𐤊, and this again, passing through the Arabic ٱذن, becomes the Hebrew 𐤀𐤅𐤊. In almost every case, indeed, if we strike off the supplementary Semitic augments, we obtain a biliteral base which can thus be connected with the Arian languages.

In *Gaushá* the final 𐬚 stands for 𐬚𐬚, and that the radical vowel is subjected to the *guna*, is supported by a comparison with the Zend and Sanskrit correspondents.

𐬚 g (with u).

𐬚 𐬚𐬚 𐬚𐬚 𐬚𐬚 𐬚𐬚 Gudrush², [Col. II., l. 65, p. 222,]

Gudrus. The name of a city of Media, where the arch-rebel Phraortes fought his last battle with Darius, and which may be conjectured to have been somewhere in the vicinity of the modern Casvín, as the Median chief, on his defeat, fled from Gudrush to Rhages, and was brought back from thence to Darius, at Ecbatana. I should wish to connect the name with that of the great Scythic tribe, of which, under the various titles of Cadrusi⁴, Γεδρώσιοι⁵, and Καδούσιοι, we find extensive settlements to have anciently existed in the Paropamisian mountains, between Carmania

¹ See Yaçna, &c., p. 213, and sur l'Alph. Zend, p. cil., note 41. Here is a reference also to Bohlen de Orig. Ling. Zend, p. 4.

² Gesenius, however, who is fond of comparing cognate forms in the Semitic and Arian languages, does not venture on this relation. See Heb. Lex., p. 32.

³ The orthography of the name is remarkable in affording an example of the employment of 𐬚 instead of 𐬚 not in immediate connexion with the *u*, but in a groupe of which that vowel is the complement.

⁴ Pliny, lib. VI., c. 23.

⁵ The name of the province Gedrosia is variously written by the Greeks. See Cellarius, vol. II., p. 726.

and the Melas, and on the northern frontier of Media¹. The position, indeed, of the Median Cadusians would be sufficiently applicable to the geographical indication afforded by the inscriptions regarding the site of Gudrush; for we may suppose a tribe which could bring 200,000 men into the field to have occupied the entire country between Atropatene, the Caspian, and Media Magna²; but on the other hand, the assimilation of the names is more apparent than real, the termination in Cadusii being probably an ethnic suffix, while that of Gudrush is the simple case-ending of the third declension, and I cannot pretend, therefore, to consider the identity as at all established. I can neither discover, I may add, any satisfactory etymology for the name³; nor if the proposed reference of Gudrush to the Cadusii be rejected, can I find any other representative for the Median city in the ancient geography of the province.

卐 ch.

卐 <<卐 ≡ 卐 <卐 卐 CHAKHRIYÁ, [Col. I., l. 50, p. 204,] *Repugnaret*. I have been long in doubt, whether this term can be a reduplicate form of 卐, or whether it may be derived from an independent root; nor, indeed, have I yet been able to make up my mind definitively on the subject. The word occurs in the following passage, "*Niya áha martiya - - - - - hya avam Gaumdtam tyam Magum khshatram ditam chakhriyd'*," which

¹ I shall explain hereafter my reasons for connecting the Cadusii and Gedrosians, and for considering them of the Scythic rather than the Arian race.

² The Cadusians of Media, who are generally associated in Grecian history with the Sacae, have been noticed in my remarks on the Median language in Chapter II., as well as in the Mem. on Ecbatana. See Journ. Royal Geog. Soc. vol. X., p. 126. They gave the name of قادوستان *Kádustán*, to the mountains of Tárím until comparatively modern times, and are represented at the present day by the large and ancient tribe of *Garús* گروس.

³ The only Sanskrit root that I can find is 𑖦𑖯𑖫𑖜, "to lie," which will not give any suitable meaning.

⁴ See commencement of the 13th paragraph of Col. I., at Behistun.

chart, merely signifies "to bind" or "tie together." Most probably, however, the allusion is to "arranging" or "joining" the ranks preparatory to battle, as *hamar(a)nam akunava*, "they fought an action," usually follows. I have not met with a similar term either in Zend or Pehlevi; but the Persian ^{— —} چاراد, *charrad*, which signifies "a fray" or "battle," may perhaps preserve the original idea.

The termination in *aniya* must not be compared with the Sanskrit चनीय, which forms the future perfect participle. It is rather, I think, the ending of the present participle, or of a gerund which represents the present participle, in the language of the inscriptions, and I perceive therein a marked, and to me an almost inexplicable, difference from all other tongues of the same family. The only conjectural explanation indeed that I can give of so anomalous a form, and which moreover presents the peculiarity of being independent of inflexion, (*chartaniya* answering to the nominative equally of the sing. and plur. number) is that it is compounded of the regular participial ending in *an*, and of the suffix in *ya*, which gives the indeclinable preter participle of the Sanskrit. In the Median inscriptions, *chartaniya* seems to be replaced by a Turkish gerund, and this form of the verb equally answers to the past participle in the correspondent for *hagamatâ*.

𐎠𐎠𐎡 CHA, [Col. I., lines 65, 66, p. 205, &c.] *Que*. A particle used as an affix of conjunction, and (except in regard to its enclitic power,) answering to the Sans. च; Zend 𐬵𐬀; Gr. καί; Latin *que*, &c. It undoubtedly comes from the same interrogative base *ká¹*, which has produced *kash-chiya* and *ká²*; for while in Sanskrit, in old Persian, and in Zend, the guttural and palatal are used indifferently in expressing the various derivatives from

¹ Bopp's remarks on the interrogative bases are contained in the Comp. Gr., from s. 386 to s. 403.

² I suspect even the Semitic 𐤒 to be of cognate origin, though the significations which it has taken have followed a different direction of development. As Gesenius in explaining 𐤒 compares the Latin *qui*, he must be of the same opinion, though he fails to notice the connexion. See Heb. Lex., p. 456.

the bases *ka*, *ki*, *ku*, the entire series of cognate terms is written in Latin with *qu*, and in modern Persian with چ *ch'*; the elongation of the *a* in this term must be considered a mere peculiarity of orthography, and is entirely devoid of grammatical import; the particle also occurs in the composition of *hachá*, "from."

𐎠 𐎠 𐎠 𐎠𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠 𐎠𐎠 CHICHAKHRÁISH*, [Col. II., l. 9, p. 215,] *Sisacris*, (gen. case). The orthography of this name may perhaps be considered an additional reason for believing in the existence of a root *chakhra*, which may have produced the potential *chakhriyá*; for it certainly appears to be formed (like *Dadrashish* from 𐎠𐎠𐎠,) by the addition of the suffix in *i* to the reiterative form of such a verb³; and the signification of "the opposer" would be suitable enough to a proper name. Were such an etymology however to be admitted, there would still be some difficulty in accounting for the employment of 𐎠 in the reduplicate syllable⁴, and I do not give the explanation therefore with much confidence. The name is applied in the inscriptions to the father of the Persian Chief, *Martiya*, who headed the second Susian revolt, and it is interesting in affording an example of the employment of the *guna* in the case-ending of the genitive of a theme in *i*. The affix in *i* being added to *Chichakhra*, the form is obtained of *Chichakhraish* in the nom., and it is only by the addition of the *guna*, before the case-ending of the genitive, that the *á* could be elongated⁵.

¹ I say this advisedly, for the relative 𐎠𐎠, and even the interrogative 𐎠𐎠𐎠,

"when?" come from the sibilant 𐎠, passing through an aspirate.

² In the Cuneiform text this name is erroneously written *Chichikhráish*.

³ The Sanskrit, however, employs the middle, instead of the active voice, in reduplicate names of this class.

⁴ The substitution of *i* for *a* in the reduplicate syllable is, however, not unusual in Sanskrit and Zend, and is still more frequent in Greek. See Comp. Gr., s. 482.

⁵ The Sanskrit is, I believe, deficient in themes in *é*, but after the analogy of those in *i*, the nom. should certainly end in 𐎠𐎠, and the gen. in 𐎠𐎠; while themes in *ó* (= *au*) should on the same principle end in 𐎠𐎠 and 𐎠𐎠, instead of in 𐎠𐎠 and 𐎠𐎠, which is exactly reversing the application of the *guna*.

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥 CHITÁ, [Col. II., l. 48, p. 220, and l. 63, p. 222,] *Tamdiu*, or *Aliquamdiu*. In translating the second column at Behistan, where this term occurs in two different passages¹, I have conjectured it to represent a preposition governing the accus. case, and I have even sought to compare it with the Persian جدا *jiddá*, "separate" or "apart from;" further consideration, however, compels me to abandon this explanation; for in the phrase, *chitá mám amánayá*, I find that the Median certainly employs the personal pronoun as the object of the verb; a construction, indeed, which might have been presumed in the Persian from the causal form of the root, and the transitive application that should thus belong to it; *mám amánayá* is, I think, "he expected me" or "waited for me;" and *chitá*, therefore, must be explained as an independent term. Now I observe in the Median that there is no equivalent whatever for *chitá*; a single adverb expresses the relation of time, and it is almost certain therefore that *chitá* and *yátá* must be a relative and co-relative, the former being of little or no consequence to the sense. In this view, then, I suppose *chitá* to be an adverb formed from the interrogative base *ki*, (modified to *chi*;) with the same temporal suffix that we have in *yátá*, "until," and *thakatá*, "then," and I translate it by "some-time," or "so long," considering *yátá*, "until," to be its necessary and definite complement².

𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞

virtue of his supposed descent from Cyaxares¹. The term may, I think, be translated with some confidence "of a powerful race," for the elements of which it is composed are sufficiently well known to us through the Zend. That the first element, indeed, must be compared with the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀, "race," "seed," rather than with the Sanskrit चित्र, "variegated," is proved by the expression *Ariya, Ariya chitrā*, "an Arian (and) of Arian descent," in the inscription of Nakhsh-i-Rustam, where the Median uses for *chitrā* the same equivalent *chissa*, which also occurs in the Median orthography of the name of *Chitratakhma*². I shall consider this term further under its own head, and will here therefore merely observe of the second element, that it has an exact correspondent in the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *takhma*, which is always rendered in Sanskrit by *balishtha* or *dridha*, "very strong" or "powerful," and which Burnouf accordingly derives from 𐬨𐬀, "to carry" with the suffix in *ma*³, the guttural being aspirated by an orthographical law as the first member of a compound articulation. We must be careful, I may add, not to confound this word *takhma* with the Persian تخم *tukhm*, "seed," for the latter term occurs in the inscriptions under the form of *tau'mā*, being derived perhaps from a root answering to the Sanskrit तृ⁴; and the guttural which appears in the Persian correspondent, as well as in the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀, "an off-shoot," is developed from the inherent aspirative power of the vowel *u*. With the latter term also must, I think, be certainly compared the second portion of the name of *Πετρούχμης*⁵, and probably the same word, signifying "seed," is found in the *Πιτταραιχμης* of

¹ For remarks on the connexion of the Medes and Sagartians, see under the head *Asagarta*.

² From *chitra*, "variegated," we have both *chitar*, "the spotted leopard," and *chit*, the English "*chintz*," from its variegated patterns.

³ See notes to Inscription No. 6, lines 14, 15, p. 293.

⁴ See Yaçna, p. 40, for a detailed examination of this word; it is very commonly employed in Zend.

⁵ This will be explained more fully under the head *Tau'mā*.

⁶ Or *Πετρούχμης* in Ctesias. See Phot. Bib., Col. 128.

Herodotus¹, and in the *ῥοταίχῳ*s of Æschylus, although in these two last examples the change of the vowel is, to say the least of it, suspicious.

The name of *Chitratakhma* is not, I believe, to be found in any Greek author, but it would regularly in that language be written *Σιττατάχῳ*s. In the Median and Babylonian, however, the orthography is strangely disfigured, (*Chissa'ankhwa* in the one, and perhaps *Sija'ankhma* in the other,) and if therefore the Greeks had taken the pronunciation from either of those sources, they might omit the dental of *takhma*².

The noun is regularly declined as a masculine theme in short *a*, and the terminations above given are those of the nom., the accus., and the instrumental cases.

𐎠𐎠𐎠 CHITRA, [Ins. No. 6, line 14, 15, p. 292,] *E stirpe*, or *ortus, satus*. I compare this term immediately with the Zend *𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 chithra*, which certainly signifies "race," or "seed," but for which I have never yet seen any satisfactory etymology³. Remembering, however, the tendency to interchange between the palatal and guttural which we have seen in the derivatives from the interrogative bases, I am inclined to refer *chithra* to the root *kit*, 𐎠𐎠𐎠, "to dwell" or "abide," the idea of a "race" or "family," being bound up with that of its residence in a particular spot. The term has survived in modern Persian only in the name of *Minuchehr* 𐎠𐎠𐎠; but as that epithet, signifying

¹ Lib. VII., p. 32. *Tori* and *Tritan* are certainly proper names, and a term implying "descent" would seem therefore to be the most suitable suffix; but I know not the meaning of *ῥs* in *Hystæchmes*.

² The omission of this radical dental letter in the Median and Babylonian, has sometimes led me to suspect that the 𐎠𐎠𐎠 and 𐎠𐎠𐎠 might coalesce in the Persian pronunciation of the name; but such an amalgamation seems to be etymologically impossible. The nasal development before the guttural is a striking characteristic of language, which the Median and Babylonian possess in common.

³ I think I have seen some remarks by Burnouf on the Zend *chithra*, but I cannot now refer to the passage.

⁴ De Sacy has some good remarks on *Minuchehr* in his *Persian Antiquities*, p. 93, sqq. I strongly suspect, however, that *minu* is the Indian 𑀢𑀺𑀭𑀸 with the change of the *r* into *n*.

haps "quamdiu") "observes quicquid agendum." Of one thing at any rate I am convinced, that *chiyakarma* is not the 1st pers. of a reduplicate aorist, as is conjectured by Lassen and Westergaard¹, nor indeed any reduplicate form of कृ, but that the prefix comes from the interrogative base *ki*, and that the said prefix is united to a neuter noun, answering to the Sans. कर्मन्, which makes its nom. and accus. in कर्मे. The complement or co-relative to *chiyakarma*, which occurs immediately afterwards as *patikarma*, places the identity of the noun, I think, beyond dispute; and whether the prefix *chiya*, therefore, may give a definite or indefinite signification to the idea of "action" or "conduct" to be observed, I do not regard as of much consequence².

कि चि चि चि चि चि चि

CHISHCHIYA, [Col. I., l. 53, p. 204,] *Quisque*.

CHIYA, [Passim,] - - - *que, quid*.

These are masculine and neuter forms proceeding from the interrogative base *ki*. *Chish* is the true nominative masculine which exists in the Vedic नाषिः and नाषिः, as well as in the Zend ماچس māchis, and ماچس naéchis, and which is absolutely identical with the Latin "quis³." Professor Bopp, I believe, first identified the Vedic pronoun which had been lost by the grammarians, (*mākir* and *nākir* being classed among the indeclinables); and if the corroborative proofs afforded by the Zend and by the Sanskrit itself, (*mākim* and *nākim* occurring in the accusative) had been insufficient to confirm the discovery, the

¹ Lassen supposes *chiyakarma* to be substituted for *achikaram*. See Ueber die Keilinschrift, p. 105, and Westergaard in his Median Memoir, although he correctly identifies the correspondent, does not attempt to alter the translation. See the Copenhagen Memoir, p. 383.

² It appears to me, indeed, that there is the same relation in regard to action between *chiyakarma* and *patikarma*, as I have already remarked between *chitá* and *yátá*, in regard to time; *chi* or *chiya*, from the interrogative base *ki*, seems to give an indefinite sense, which requires afterwards to be brought out and individualized by a definite complement.

³ See Comp. Gr., ss. 390 and 398, for some excellent remarks on this pronoun; also Burnouf's Yaçna, Notes, &c., p. 142, where the value of Bopp's discovery is fully admitted.

verification would at any rate have been completed by the Cuneiform *chishchiya*, where the nom. occurs without the disfigurement of a prefixed particle¹.

Chiya, also, is the neuter form of the same pronoun, which, after the analogy of the masc. nom. and accus. should have been found in Sanskrit as चिन्, but which in reality has been altered to चिन्, a form that has also been preserved in the Zend چي, and in the Latin "quid". But although *chiya* (or *chit*) was certainly in its origin a neuter pronoun², it came to be used in Sanskrit, in Zend, and in old Persian, exclusively as an indefinite affix, and in this sense it is represented by the Latin *que*, in *quisque*, *uterque*, &c.³ I have repeatedly alluded to its enclitical power, and I will here therefore merely give a list of the words in which it is found. These are *chishchiya*, "every one," *kashchiya*, "any one," *hauvachiya*, "such a one," *avashchiya*, "such as that," *aniyashchiya*, "else or other," and a compound tense *paruvamachiya*, which probably signifies "in the time before me;" the power of the suffix in every instance being to give an indefinite signification to the preceding word.

𐎠 𐎠 𐎠 𐎠 𐎠 𐎠

CHISHPAISH, [Detach. Ins. A, l. 8, p. 261,] *Teispes*.

CHISHPÁISH, { Col. I., line 5, 6, p. 196, } *Teispis*,

CHISHPAISHAHYÁ, { Detach. Ins. A, l. 8, p. 261, } (gen. sing).

There is equal difficulty in ascertaining the etymology of this name, which is applied to the son of Achæmenes, and in identifying the class to which it belongs. I suspect, however, that *chish* (or perhaps *chaish*.) may be for the Sanskrit चेश, "hair," the

¹ The nom. masc. would no doubt present the orthography of *chish* in the inscription without the addition of the enclitic *chiya*, for the sibilant case-ending is preserved after the vowel *i*.

² The orthographical change of *chit* into *chiya* has been repeatedly explained, and does not affect the grammatical question in any way.

³ For remarks on the very ancient neuter in *i* or *d*, (compare 𐎠, "*id*;" चिन्, "*quid*," &c.), see Comp. Gr., s. 157.

⁴ "*Que*," as the indefinite suffix, is probably a weakening of "*quid*;" as the copulative adjunct it comes from a different base, *ka*.

the Devanagari aspirate were replaced by a Cuneiform dental, that the palatal could be still used as the letter of reduplication¹, I am now compelled to seek for some other etymology.

Remembering, then, the tendency of the Sanskrit gutturals to subside into Cuneiform palatals of the same grade, of which we have seen numerous examples in the substitution of 𐎧 *ch*, for 𐎠, I venture to compare *jad* with the Sanskrit गच्छ, "to ask" or "beg". If this identification, however, be correct, we must suppose the verb in the old Persian to have been of the fourth rather than of the tenth conjugation; for in the first place the radical vowel is not elongated, and secondly, although *diya* in the inscriptions would legitimately stand for 𐎠 owing to the repugnance of the language to compound letters, it could hardly replace 𐎠; the less, indeed, as we have an undoubted example of the 1st pers. sing. present of the tenth class in *dárayámiya*, where the conjugational suffix is used precisely as it is in Sanskrit, without the euphonic *i* preceding it². The elongation, also, of the *a* before the personal-ending, which is likewise common to the Zend and Sanskrit, is another source of difficulty so far as regards its grammatical explanation; where we have *áhya* in the 2nd, and *átiya* in the 3rd person, I have supposed the employment of the subjunctive rather than the indicative mood; but

that the *y* may be the vowel of connexion, cannot certainly be maintained; for the 𐎧 and 𐎠 represent the same dental power, and the substitution of the latter for the former must be owing to the previous existence of the *i*, which, indeed, should thus either be a radical letter, or at any rate the representative of some definite grammatical power.

¹ The interchange of *d* and *h* in roots, also, must always be suspicious, for the Devanagari aspirate is the degradation rather than the type of the Cuneiform dental; that it is not unknown, however, is shown by the root गुह्, "to hide," which is 𐎧 *guz*, in Zend, and *gud* in the inscriptions.

² An objection, however, occurs to this assimilation in the retention of the guttural under its proper form, in the Persian 𐎧 *gadá*, "a beggar."

³ I have already indeed observed, that the suffixes of the fourth and tenth conjugations appear to be everywhere distinguished, *iya* standing for 𐎠, and *aya* for 𐎠.

jadyāmiya and *dārayāmiya* are unquestionably forms of the indicative present, and we may perhaps therefore refer the employment of the long *a* in these terms, to the immediate derivation of the personal ending from the substantive verb rather than from a pronominal suffix. This, however, is, I confess, a most obscure point of grammar, which I have neither the inclination nor the requisite knowledge to discuss¹.

In line 21 of Insc. No. 3, Westergaard would appear to have *jadyāniya* instead of *jadyāmiya*, but I doubt the correctness of his copy. If, however, the former reading be the true one, the verb is used in the imperative instead of in the present.

𐎧𐎫 𐎧𐎫 JAN. A root answering to the Sanskrit *हन्*, and Zend *jan* or *zan*, from which we have in the inscriptions the following derivatives:—

- JADIYA, [Col. III., l. 15, p. 230, &c., &c.,] *Debella*.
- JATÁ, [Col. II., l. 21, p. 216, l. 84, p. 226, &c.,] *Debellate*.
- AJANAM, [Col. I., l. 89, p. 211, l. 95, p. 213, &c.,] *Profligavi—debellavi*.
- AJA, [Passim,] *Profligavit—debellavit*.
- JATÁ, [Col. IV., l. 58, p. 251, l. 78, p. 256,] *Hostis—debellator*.

Jadiya and *jatá* are the regular forms of the 2nd person of the imperative singular and plural of a verb of the second class, the Sanskrit correspondents being *जहि* and *हन्*. *Jadiya*, however, must not be compared immediately with *जहि*, but rather

¹ Bopp (Comp. Gr., s. 434,) considers this lengthening of the class-vowel in the 1st pers. as an orthographical effect of the *m* or *v* which follows; but I cannot help thinking that as the Vedic ending *ámasi*, (Zend *ámahi*) for the 1st pers. plur. of the present tense of the active voice is evidently a contraction of the substantive verb *asmasi*, (the original form of *smasi*,) (Bopp, however, (s. 439) derives the Vedic *smasi* from the dependent pronoun *sma*,) so *ámi* in the sing. must also come from *asmi*. For the plur.-endings, see an excellent note in Burnouf's *Yaçna*, Notes et Eclair., p. 70.

² The identity of the initial letter indeed is accidental, for the Cuneiform 𐎧𐎫 is a radical letter, which is used in every form of the verb; whereas the *ज्ञ* in *जहि* is a euphonic substitute: *handhi* by the lapse of the nasal has become in the first place *hadhi*; the dental being no longer supported by a preceding consonant has then been softened to an aspirate, giving the form of *hahi*, and to avoid the itera-

with the primitive form which must once have existed of हन्ति¹, and in the same way *jatá* will stand for a primitive हन्. I have explained the forms of *aja* and *ajanam*, which represent the 3rd and 1st persons singular of the active imperfect under the head *avája*, and I have shown that they stand for the Sanskrit primitive forms अहन् and अहने, the former of which in the modern language has become अहन्, owing to the inadmissibility of a compound letter as a silent terminal², but which in the old Persian must have had the form of *ajat* before it was contracted into *aja*.

The term *jatá*, which occurs as a noun in the eleventh and seventeenth paragraphs of the fourth column at Behistun, must be the nom. of हन्, which is formed with the *unádi* affix of agency from the same root हन्. It probably, however, in the old Persian signifies "an enemy," rather than "a murderer" or "slayer," as in Sanskrit. In the other forms the root has the regular acceptation of "defeating" or "subduing".

From the various orthographies employed to express this root, we see that the sonant palatal, equally with the sonant dental, was the intermediate stage by which the Devanagari aspirate passed into the modern *z*; for the Cuneiform *jan* stands half-way between the Sanskrit *han*, and the Persian ز *zan*, "strike," and the two forms even of 𐎠𐎵 and 𐎠𐎶, were co-existent in the Zend³.

Several compounds also from this root are found in the inscriptions. I have already explained *avája* and *avájanam*,

tion, the initial aspirate has been, by a last process of degradation, converted to its reduplicate correspondent.

¹ In the Vedas the termination in ह्ति is preserved in some roots of the second general class without any reference to the preceding letter being a vowel or a consonant; but the mutilated form of *hi* is also extant. In Zend and old Persian, however, the employment of the primitive dental is constant and uniform. See Comp. Gr., s. 450, and Rosen's Rig Veda, Adnotat., p. viii.

² See Bopp's Comp. Gr., ss. 94 and 461.

³ Westergaard (Rad. Ling. Sana., p. 199) gives examples of the root हन्, with the meaning of "deicere," "vincere," "destruere," &c.

⁴ For examples of *jaiñti* and *jata* from the root *han*, see Yaçna, Alph. Zend, p. 71.

which have the signification of "slaying." *Frđjanam*, the 1st pers. sing. of an active imperfect, answering to the Sanskrit *म्राहन्*¹, likewise occurs at Behistun, Col. II., lines 74 and 89, with the meaning of "I cut off," and the most natural explanation of the doubtful word *patiyajata*, (Ins. No. 6, l. 47,) would be to consider it as the 3rd pers. sing. of the middle imperf. of the same root preceded by the particle *प्रति*, the *y* in that case being required to connect the vowel *i* with the temporal augment. I shall examine *patiyajata*, however, at greater length in its proper alphabetical place.

𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 (j with i).

𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 JIVÁ, [Col. IV., l. 56, p. 250, and l. 75, p. 254,]

Vivas. I consider this term to be the imperfect subjunctive in the 2nd pers. sing., the correspondent of which in the Vedic dialect would be *जीवाः*², from the root *जीव्*, "to live." The observation, also, that I have previously made in my notes to the 10th paragraph, Col. IV., at Behistun, stating that the 2nd pers. sing. of the imperative would present the same orthography, requires, I think, to be modified; for as the language of the inscriptions did not distinguish between long and short vowels, it is probable that the radical vowels *i* and *u* were affected by the *guna* in the special tenses of all roots of the first conjugation, and that the imper. form of *jiv*, therefore, would be written

𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 *jaivá*. It is moreover in perfect accordance with the genius of the Zend to employ the imperfect of the subjunctive with an optative present signification³, and the term

¹ I am not sure, however, that this form is ever used. Westergaard gives *म्राधानि* for the passive aorist with the substitution of *प्र* for *हृन्*, which as Wilson (Dict., p. 968,) remarks, takes place in most of the inflexions and derivatives of the Sanskrit root.

² Bopp has some brief remarks on the imperfect subjunctive of the Vedas in the Comp. Gr., s. 714.

³ Burnouf gives a great number of examples of the subjunctive imperf. in Zend, in an admirable note to the Yaçna, marked S, p. 148; and the signification is uniformly that of the optative or subjunctive present.

biyd, which occurs in the 3rd pers. in apposition with *jivd*, at Behistun, can only be of that mood and tense, for the terminations of the 3rd pers. of the imper. are in the old Persian *tuva*, in the active, and *tám* in the middle voice. In Zend, the palatal of the root जीव् appears to have been hardened in some forms to an aspirate, for we have in the Vendidad (Fargard XVIII.) 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *darēghō gava*, "long-lived," whilst in the modern Persian زیستی *zistan*, "to live," it has been softened to a sibilant.

𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 JIVAHYÁ, [Col. V., line 20, 21, p. 259, and l. 36 p. 260,] *Vitæ*? We have probably in this word the genitive case of जीवः, "life," but the passages in which it occurs are too much mutilated to admit of the signification being verified.

𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 t.

𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 TAK(A)BARÁ, [Insc. No. 6, l. 29, p. 294,] *Tacabri*. An ethnic title occurring in the geographical list at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, and which I am inclined to identify as that which gave its modern name to *Tabaristán*¹. The *Tabaris*, however, of Oriental history, are always supposed to have derived their title from ^{تبر} *tabar*, "an axe," the favourite

¹ See Vendidad, Bomb. lithographed edition, p. 482. I take the meaning of *darēghō gava* from Burnouf. (See Yaçna, p. 533, note 386.) The Zend, however, retains a purer form, as 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *jvō*, "living," from 𐬔𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀; while the guttural obtains in the Lithuanian *gyva*, and the Goth. *quiv*; from the latter, also, Bopp derives the Latin *viv*, and he supposes even the Greek ζῶν and βίος to be of cognate origin. See Comp. Gr., Eng. Ed., vol. I., p. 119.

² There is an excellent article in Yákút's Lexicon, on the origin of the name of *Tabaristán*, written by the Arabs طبرستان.

³ See particularly for this derivation the *Tárikh-i-Tabaristán*, Pers. M.S. The axe was not only the national weapon of the Scythians, but was especially used by the Caspian tribes to clear away the forests for their habitations.

weapon of the Caspian foresters, and I know not exactly how to assimilate this etymology with the Cuneiform term. The last element, indeed, in the compound *Tak(a)bará* would seem to be a verbal affix, and I should rather translate the name "the axe-bearers," (*Taka*, "an axe," from 𐎧𐎠𐎫 , "to cut" or "hew"¹?), or perhaps, "the wood-cutters." (Compare the Persian تخت *takht bur*.)

Another question of some interest is to consider whether the *Tároupoi* or *Tanúpoi* of the Greeks really represent this tribe. Undoubtedly the *Tapuri*, in the course of their migration from Scythia to Media, inhabited at one time the Caspian provinces², and as the *Bun Dehesh* has preserved the orthography of *Taprastán* in describing these provinces, it is possible that there may be a connexion between the names; but in that case we must distinguish, I think, the *Tak(a)bará* of the inscriptions from the *Tabaris* of Persian history; for the Greek reading of *Tároupoi* is too constant to admit of much doubt as to the pronunciation of the name under the Parthians, and I know not of any orthographical law that could have led to the absorption of the long vowel. It would be more reasonable to suppose that we have a trace of the name of the *Tak(a)bará* in the *Táμβρα* or *Táμβραξ* of Polybius³, which was one of the chief cities of Hyrcania; for the Babylonian employs, I think, the nasal *ñ* in the place of the guttural⁴ in expressing the title in question; and as the nasal, also, was legi-

¹ *Tishah*, and *tabar*, in Persian, are both evidently connected with the root 𐎧𐎠𐎫 , but I know not exactly how the latter is formed.

² *Takht* or *takhtah*, however, is properly the participle 𐎧𐎠𐎫 , "cut" or "fashioned."

³ For the various seats of the Tapyri, see the authorities in Cellarius, tom. II., pp. 665, 756, and 707. As they are not mentioned among the Caspian tribes, either by Herodotus or Ctesias, I conclude that their immigration from Scythia occurred under the Parthians. Perhaps, however, the *Tibarani* of Asia Minor were a kindred race, who had moved earlier to the west.

⁴ *Κείσθαι οὐ μακρὰν τῆς Τάμβρακος*. Lib. X., c. 28.

⁵ In Westergaard's Babylonian copy of the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscription, the name is difficult to be recognized, owing to the epithet applied to the preceding *yundá*, and to the mutilation of the distinctive sign 𐎶 . I read it, however, *Tañpara*. The Babylonian, indeed, thus constantly uses the same letter for a nasal and a guttural.

timately interchangeable with the *l*, there would be no objection to recognize the same name in the *Ταλαβρόκα* of Strabo¹, the final syllable in both of these Greek forms being the Scythic affix of locality.

I will only add, that the final *á*, standing for the Sanskrit *आ*, marks the nom. plur. masc., and that I place the *a* of the first element of the compound in a parenthesis, to admit of the possible contraction of *Takbar* into *Tabar*.

𐎧𐎶𐎵 𐎧𐎶 𐎶𐎵 𐎧𐎶 TACHARAM, [Insc. No. 2, l. 6, p. 271.] *Sculpturam*. The Cuneiform root *tach*, from which this term must be derived, should, I think, correspond more regularly with *तक्ष* than with *तच्छ*; for the Devanagari gutturals, as we know, have a general tendency to subside in the old Persian into palatals of the same grade. It is very possible, however, that the two Sanskrit roots, although signifying respectively "to bear," and "to cut" or "carve," may be of cognate origin, for there is much difficulty in distinguishing in Zend between the derivatives of *𐎧𐎶𐎵* *tak*, and *𐎧𐎶𐎵* *tas*, which answer to *तक्ष* and *तच्छ*, and in Greek, also, *τάσσω* and *τείνω* are connected both in sense and sound². The Cuneiform *takhma* which occurs in *Chitratakhma* can only be translated "strong" or "powerful," and the adjective certainly comes from the root *tak*, "to bear;" yet, in the name of *Tak(a)bará*, the same root would appear to have the signification of *taksh*, "to cut" or "carve." On the other hand, *tacharam* or *tachram*, formed with the *unadi* affix in *तक्ष* from *tach*, will more suitably denote "a sculpture" than "a work;" while the 1st pers. of the middle aorist *hamatakhshiya*, which must also be derived, I think, from *tach*, (as *अपयि* from *पय*), certainly signifies "I laboured³." In the compound *us(a)tashanám*, also,

¹ See lib. XI., p. 350. Strabo, however, names the capital *Τάρη*, a title which may be perhaps of kindred origin.

² Burnouf has some excellent remarks on the analogy and distinction between the various derivatives in Zend from the Sanskrit roots *tak* and *taksh*, in his Commentary on the Yaçna, pp. 143, 168, and 299.

³ We must remember, also, that *takhsha* in Pali became *takha*, by a law of

where *tashan* appears to represent the Zend *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀*, the meaning of "skilfully made" and "skilfully sculptured" will be equally applicable, and from this general confusion, therefore, between the acceptations in which the root is to be taken, I infer a common origin for the ideas of "bearing" or "labouring," and of "fashioning" or "carving;" and I suppose the difference between the Cuneiform *tak* and *tach* to be of the same character as that which we have seen in the varying orthography of the interrogative bases.

𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀 TARS. A root answering to the Sans. तर्, Zend

𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬀 *tērēs*, and Persian تَرَس *tars*. It is however, I suspect, like many other of the supposed stem-words of the Sanskrit, a compound, or at any rate an augmented root, for the primary element *tra* would appear to be cognate with ॢ दृ *dri*, which has the same signification of "fearing" or "being afraid." Compare the Gr. *τρέω*, *τρέμω*, Latin *ter-reo*, *tre-mo*, *trepido*, Eng. "dread," "tremble," &c. The verb in the inscriptions, as in Sanskrit, is of the first class, and occurs under the following forms:—

TARSATIYA, [Insc. No. 3, l. 11, 12, p. 274,] *Timet*.

TARSAM, [Insc. No. 4, l. 21, p. 282,] *Timeam*.

ATARSA, [Col. I, l. 50, 51, p. 204, Insc. No. 4, l. 9, p. 279,] *Timuit*.

The original Sanskrit root answering to the Cuneiform *tars* should, I think, be तृश्¹; for in the first place we must expect in both languages to see the radical vowel affected with the *guna* in the

orthography. Hence, *Tákala*, or *Takkasila*, for the Sans. तक्षशिलः; as also, पुष्कल became *Pukkala*, (Gr. Πεύκαλα,) and तुर्क became *Turukka*, the true original of *Τούρκ* or *تُرک* *Turk*, for I pay no respect whatever to the fabulous derivation from *Thu-kü*, "a helmet."

¹ तृश् it must be remembered in Sans. would be an impossible orthography, the vowel ऋ necessarily aspirating the following dental sibilant; and it is on this account, I imagine, that roots in श् invariably change the radical vowel ऋ to the homogeneous consonant र.

special tenses; and secondly, if *tras* had been a primary form it would have been expressed before the vowel *a* in the inscriptions, according to the laws of orthographical change, by *thrah*. *Tarsa-tiya*, in the 3rd pers. sing. of the pres., therefore, must be compared with a primitive *तर्शति* rather than with *चसति*, (which in the old Persian would give the form of *thrahatiya*,) and the 1st and 3rd persons of the imperfect, *tarsam* and *atarsa*, will answer to *तर्शे* and *चतर्शेत्*, instead of the modern forms of *चसं* and *चचसत्*. *Tarsam*, I must add, which has lost its augment of past time in consequence of being preceded by the interdictory particle *má*, will perhaps orthographically represent the 1st pers. sing. of the aorist¹, as well as of the imperf., and if we followed the idiom of the classical Sanskrit, where the aorist is alone used with the particle *má*, to express "dissuasion," without reference to time, we should be inclined, therefore, to accept of the former explanation; but in the Vedas, it must be remembered, the imperfect is employed in the same manner with equal frequency²; and as Vedic analogy is, I think, usually to be preferred to that of the classical Sanskrit in illustrating the old Persian grammar, there can accordingly be no objection to consider *atarsa* and *tarsam* to belong to the regular imperfect of the active voice. Whichever be the tense employed, the translation of *má tarsam* will be the same, "*ne timeam*," "let me not fear."

𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎠𐎶𐎠𐎶𐎠𐎶𐎠𐎶 TÁRVÁ, [Col. III., l. 22, p. 231.] *Tarba*.

The name of a city in the district of *Yutiya*, which appears under Darius to have been one of the divisions of Persis proper. It may possibly be identical with *Tapováva*, which is placed by Ptolemy in the western frontier of Carmania, and which again may derive its title from the river named by the same author *Δάπα*, but

¹ Compare the 1st pers. sing. of the aorist, *चदर्शे*, from the root *दृश्*, "to see."

² Lassen, indeed, (Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 247,) says that the imperfect is also used in the classical Sanskrit without the augment after the particle *má*, but Wilkins, s. 1310, restricts the employment of the tense in that shape to where it appears in composition with *मास्*. If Bopp be right in identifying the augment with the privative *a*, (see Comp. Gr., s. 537, sqq.,) it may be dropped in these positions to avoid a double negation.

by Pliny *Daras*. Etymologically, also, I should wish to compound the name of the Sans. *नल*, "clear," and *वः*, "water!," perhaps even it would be less objectionable to compare *Tárvá* with the modern *Dáráb-jird*, then to refer the latter term to a corruption of the name of Darius¹.

𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿 𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿 𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿 TIGRA, [Col. II., l. 39, p. 219.] *Tigra*. The name of an Armenian fort, which may possibly be the same as the *Τρυάρα* of Ptolemy, placed by that geographer in the vicinity of the Cyrus or Kúr², but which more probably took its title from the river Tigris, on the upper course of which it was situated. I shall examine the etymology of the term under the following head, and will merely therefore add, that in expressing the name, the Median exactly reproduces the Persian orthography.

𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿 𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿 𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿 TIGRÁ-M, [Col. I., ls. 85 and 88, p. 211 and Col. V., l. 23, p. 259.] *Tigridem*. This is the accusative case of *Tigrá*, under which orthography the ancient Persians represented the name of the Tigris. According to the consentient testimony of Greek and Latin authors, the term signifying in the old Persian language "an arrow," was applied to the river in consequence of the rapidity of its current⁴. I have little hesitation, therefore, in deriving *Tigrá* from *𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎿*, *tij*, "to sharpen,"

¹ *Vas* would be written *vá* in the Cuneiform, as *𐎠𐎼𐎿* has become *ká*.

² For remarks on the Persian *دآراب* *Dáráb*, see under the head *Dár(a)-yavush*.

³ Lib. VI., c. 2. Agathodæmon's map places *Tigrana* upon the Cyrus; and it may be presumed, that in common with *Τρυανόκετρα* and *Τρυανόαμα*, the city took its name from King Tigranes; but whether under this title we are to understand (with Strabo, Appian, and Plutarch,) the famous opponent of Lucullus, or whether we are to ascribe the above-named cities to that more ancient monarch of Armenia, the Tigranes who is mentioned by Xenophon in the *Cyropædia*, and who, according to the native tradition, vanquished the Median King Astyages, must remain a doubtful question. St. Martin has collected all the authorities on the subject in his *Armenian Researches*, tom. I., p. 173.

⁴ Among other authorities, see Strabo, l. XI., p. 529, Pliny, lib. VI., c. 27, and Q. Curtius, lib. III., &c. The notices of the ancients have been collected by Wahl, *Pers. Reich.*, p. 709.

either with the *unadi* affix in त्र, or, as it is more probably a feminine adjective, with the attributive त्र', and it is no doubt the same term which has been softened in modern Persian into تیر *tir*¹. The root त्रि, indeed, has given birth to a great number of cognate derivatives; compare Sanskrit त्रिगम् *tigma*, "sharp," where the same hardening has taken place of the palatal to a guttural; Arm. Տէգ *teg*, "a javelin," Pers. تیغ *tigh*, "a blade," تیز *tiz*, "sharp," "quick," &c. I prefer at the same time considering *tigra* in its primitive form to have been an adjective, (signifying "sharp" or "rapid," and thus equally applicable to "an arrow" and to "the river,") rather than the abstract name of an object², from observing the attributive etymology of the *Ufrđtarush* or Euphrates, and from finding also that the Arian nations, when the original name of the Tigris had been so corrupted by Semitic orthographical changes as to be no longer distinguished in its pristine sense, reproduced from another root a synonymous epithet, by which, in their sacred books, the river in question alone continued to be known. This epithet, *Arvand*, unquestionably signifies "rapid," and that under its Pehlevi corruption of *Arg* or *Arang*, it was especially employed to denote the Tigris, is shown by the direct testimony of *Hamzeh* of *Isfahán*, who says, that in his day, even the *Dijleh* of the Arabs was known to the Persians as the رود ارنگ *Arang rud*, and the كودك دريا *Kudak darya*, ("little sea".)

¹ For these affixes, see Wilkins, s. 874, and s. 913.

² The softening of the old *tr* into *r* in modern Persian is very frequent, but the only other example that I remember of *gr* becoming *r* is in the modern *Zár* for the ancient *Záypos*.

³ See Preface to Whiston's *Mos. Chorenensis*, p. v.

⁴ It has been often remarked, that the names of objects are in fact in almost every instance adjectives, being derived from the quality which the object embodies.

⁵ *Arvand* does not occur in Zend as the name of a river, but it is found in the Pazend hymn to the Amahaspaṇda. See Anquetil's *Zend Avesta*, tom. II., p. 78.

⁶ Burnouf has some elaborate remarks on the etymology of *Arvand*, in the *Yaçna*, p. 248, and he discusses the connexion between *Arvand* and *Arg*, in his notes to the same work, p. 181; but the evidence of *Hamzeh*, an excellent Persian scholar, who lived at the end of the fourth century of the Hijreh, and whom I quote from *Yákút's Lex.*, in voce *Dijleh*, is conclusive against Burnouf's attempted iden-

Under the head '*Ufrítaiuvá*, I have noted the important inference to be drawn from our finding the names of the two great rivers of Mesopotamia to be of genuine Arian etymology. An Arian must, I think, have preceded a Semitic colonization of *Shinár*; and the antiquity of the primitive colonists may be judged of from the fact of the vernacular *Tigra* having been corrupted by their successors to *Dekel*, as early as the time of Moses. Gesenius has availed himself of some apocryphal Zend and Pehlevi forms, which he writes *Tedsherem* and *Tedshera*, but which are certainly unknown as geographical titles in any part of the Zend Avesta, to distinguish the Greek *Týps* and the Hebrew *Hiddekel* הַדְּקֶל. The latter he appears to regard as an independent title employed especially by the Jews, while he derives immediately from the spurious *Tedshera*, not only the Greek *Týps*, but the Chaldee ܕܝܬܝܪܐ, the Syriac ܕܝܬܝܪܐ, and the Arabic دجلة; but this is certainly a false distinction. Most other critics are agreed that the initial syllable in *Hiddekel* is a redundant prefix*, and that the form which remains after the elision of this prefix is identical with the modern *Dijleh*. The change, indeed, from *Tigra* to *Dikel* or *Dijleh*, is in perfect accordance with the Semitic usage of expressing Arian names, and it dates probably from the first Semitic occupation of *Shinár*. Pliny, as it is well known, has preserved the double form of *Tigris* and *Diglito* as applying to the same river, and I may add,

tification of the *Arg* of the Bun Dehesh with the Jaxartes. It is curious, at the same time, that I find in my copy of the Bun Dehesh, which is a very correct manuscript, the name of the river in question invariably written *Arvand*, and not *Arg*; the latter, indeed, which is the uniform orthography employed by Anquetil, being, I suspect, the Parsi corruption of the Pehlevi and Pazend term. This latter form, still further altered to *Arang*, is used as I have said by Hamzeh, while Firdousi, (Ed. Mac., tom. I., p. 39), in speaking of the Tigris, continues to employ the old orthography of آروند *Arvand*. There is a good note on the *Arg rúd* of the Bun Dehesh, in Sprenger's Massoudi, tom. I., p. 243.

* See Gesenius' Lex., Eng. Ed., p. 321.

* Onkelos and Jonathan write דַּיְקָלָת, exactly like the Arab. دجلة.

* Gesenius considers the ד as a peculiar Hebrew prefix; while Morinus regards it as a radical, which was frequently elided by the Chaldees and Syrians. All the Greek and Latin authorities regarding the derivation and meaning of the name are collected by Morinus in his Treatise, p. 25, prefixed to Bochart's Phaleg.

that although *Dijleh* has remained in use amongst the inhabitants of Mesopotamia to the present day, that the name had been subjected under the Sassanians to a still further corruption is evident from its being compared by Hamzeh with the Pehlevi forms of *دیلد* or *دیلدا* *Dildha* or *Dildhá*¹.

𐭠𐭡𐭢 𐭠𐭡𐭢 𐭠𐭡𐭢 𐭠𐭡𐭢 𐭠𐭡𐭢 𐭠𐭡𐭢 𐭠𐭡𐭢 TIGRAKHUDÁ, [Inscrip. No. 6, l. 26, p. 294.] *Tigricolæ*. An epithet applied in the Inscription of Nakhsh-i-Rustam to the western division of the Persian Sacæ, and referring, doubtless, to their habitat on the Upper Tigris. I have been unable at the same time to find any correspondent for *khudá*, either in Sanskrit, Zend, or Persian, and suppose the term accordingly, as an affix of locality, to have been adopted by the tribe from their own vernacular Scythic². Whether the *Saká Tigrakhudá* are to be referred ethnographically to that powerful body of Scyths who held possession of Media for twenty-eight years during the reign of Cyaxares, and who ever after, in classical history, are associated or confounded with the Medes and Cadusians³, or whether they may not rather represent the more ancient Chasdim or Chaldeans, whose Scythic origin has been so frequently surmised, I shall consider in another place; but, nevertheless, I cannot avoid noticing at present such few points of evidence as we possess, for establishing the geographical identity of the colony on the Tigris. That *Tigrakhudá*, then, is an epithet, applying particularly to this division of the Sacæ, rather than the title of an independent country, is shown by the employment of the relative particle, which, although omitted in the Persian, is preserved in the Median intermediately

¹ Yákút, in the Mo'ejem, (*in voc.* دجيل and دجله) quoting from Hamzeh, gives the Pehlevi forms as the originals of the Arabic *Dijleh*, but they do not occur in the Bun Dehash, nor, indeed, have I met with them in any other author.

² The Median exactly reproduces the Persian orthography of this name, but it is impossible to draw any argument therefrom as to the etymon of the title. The Babylonian form of the name is unfortunately too much mutilated to be legible.

³ There is a curious paper by Freret, in the Mem. de l'Académie, tom. X., p. 679, (12mo Edit.,) in which he endeavours to prove the Sacæ and Cadusii of Xenophon to have inhabited Babylonia.

between the names¹, and that it must possess a geographical import, a circumstance which is indicated by its appropriate juxtaposition in the list of Satrapies with the titles of Babylon and Assyria, is confirmed, I think, by our finding the name of the Tigris, under its own proper form, employed to illustrate the expedition which was undertaken by Darius in person against the tribe in question, and which is recorded in the mutilated supplementary 5th Column at Behistun².

There is also another very important circumstance which throws a light upon this interesting colony. Herodotus particularly notices the high cap of the Sacæ³; upon the triumphal tablet at Behistun, the Scythian leader, Sakukha, is thus distinguished by the national head-dress⁴. We may, I think, indeed presume, that wherever we find this peculiar conical cap, the Scythic race is depicted, and it becomes accordingly of the highest interest to observe that on the sculptured slabs of Nimrud, the high-capped warriors are apparently exhibited under two distinct social phases. On the outer walls, which seem to have been constructed out of the debris of some prior edifice⁵, they are represented as vanquished enemies. In the interior of the palace, where the sculpture may be supposed to be of a later date, they appear as the triumphant followers of the king. The inference then is obvious, that the southern capital of Assyria was at some period or other reduced by the Scythians, and that it remained for a considerable time in their hands; and if we were to follow exclusively the authority of Herodotus, we might be

¹ This Median construction, indeed, is particularly remarkable, for it is so unusual in Persian to employ an isolated noun and adjective in apposition, that I should not otherwise have ventured to connect the names.

² Westergaard on the contrary, translates *Tigrakhudá*, "Lords of the arrow" or "archers," having in view apparently the analogous names of the *Saranos* (from *Saran*, "the moon" or "a bow," Mongol,) the *Comani* (from the Pers.

کمان, "a bow") or "the nation of the archers," by which title the Armenian geographer Vartan designates the Turks.—See St. Martin's *Armenia*, tom. II., p. 439.

³ The words of Herod. are, Σάκαι δὲ οἱ Σκύθαι περὶ μὲν τῇσι κεφαλῇσι κυρβασίας ἐς ὀξὺ ἀνιγμένας ὀρθὰς εἶχον πεπηγνυίας. See lib. VII., c. 64.

⁴ He is the only figure on the rock, it must be remembered, who has the conical or high-pointed cap.

⁵ This is rendered probable by the circumstance of the blocks being laid one upon the other to form a wall, without any reference to the continuity or even the direction of the sculpture.

denote "a race" or "family," precisely in the same manner as the Cuneiform *taumá*. I strongly suspect, also, that the Latin *s-temma* applied to "a line" or "pedigree," is of cognate origin, for it appears impossible to derive that meaning from the Greek *στέφειν*, "to crown". Anquetil, it must be remembered, everywhere translates 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀 *takhma*, by "race" or "seed," identifying it evidently with the Persian *tukhm*, but M. Burnouf has well distinguished between the Zend *takhma* and *taokhma*, showing that the one is an adjective signifying "strong," and that the other, which is of rare occurrence, and which he translates "rejeton," must be derived from a different root¹. With the latter, no doubt then, is to be compared the Cuneiform *taumá*; but if, as I have before suggested², the same element is to be found in the Greek names of *Τετρούχμης*, *Ἀπρόχμης*, &c., the development of the guttural will be shown to be extremely ancient, and may perhaps support the theory of M. Burnouf, that the Zend and Persepolitan were co-existent languages³.

It is necessary, also, that I should make a few observations on the inflexions. Under the heads *Athurá* and *Arbirá*, I have proposed to compare *áyá*, as the locative case-ending of the old Persian, with the primitive 𑖔𑖑𑖔𑖑 of the Vedas, rather than with the corrupted 𑖔𑖑𑖔 of the classical Sanskrit⁴. The same termination for the genitive of a feminine theme in long *á*, unquestionably stands also for *áyás*, which by a law of orthography becomes *áo* in Zend, with the shortening of the class vowel before the connecting *y*, (compare 𑖔𑖑𑖔𑖑 = 𑖔𑖑𑖔𑖑𑖔𑖑𑖔𑖑⁵;) but it is not so easy to determine whether *taumáyá*, in the ablative, may stand for *taumáyát* or *taumáyás*. Professor Bopp has certainly shown

¹ This however is the derivation usually given by etymologists, who compare the Latin *stemma* with the Greek *στέμμα*.

² See Yaçna, p. 441, Note 296.

³ Under the head *Chitratakhma*.

⁴ This is assumed generally by Burnouf throughout his Commentary on the Yaçna as an established fact.

⁵ See the reference before given to Bopp's Comp. Gr., Eng. Ed., Note to p. 215.

⁶ See Bopp's Comp. Gr., s. 192, and the list of genitives in page 210, where he compares also the Greek and Latin feminines *χώρας* and *terrâ*.

vayam, *iyam*, &c., and which is of an equally extensive application in Zend and Sanskrit¹. *Tuvam*, therefore, is for *tu + am*, and the 𐬭𐬀𐬎 is merely employed to connect the dissimilar vowels. The corresponding forms are in Sanskrit त्वं, in Zend 𐬭𐬀𐬎 *túm*, and in Boeotian Greek τοῖν.

In the accusative *thwām*, on the other hand, the base is *thwa*, answering to the Sanskrit त्व, which, as Bopp has remarked, is the theme of the oblique cases², and the 𐬭𐬀𐬎 , therefore, can only be interposed in the old Persian for the sake of euphony, and to avoid a compound articulation. The termination in *ām*, also, is the accusative case-ending in *am*, coalescing with the short *a* of the base³. Compare the Sans. त्वाम्, Zend 𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎 *thwām*, &c.

Taiya and *Taya* are used indifferently in the inscriptions for the suffix of the 2nd person. They exactly answer to the Sans. ते and Zend 𐬭𐬀𐬎, and are, I think, equally correct orthographies, the *y* in *taiya* being used to connect the *i* and *a*, and in *taya* being the direct substitute of the former vowel⁴. The forms of *mé*, *té*, *sé*, &c., are, according to Bopp, in their primary condition locatives, (*té* being a contraction of *twé*, for *twai*), with which corresponds the Zend 𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎 *thwóí*, and it is owing to a grammatical artifice that they are substituted for datives⁵. In the few examples which occur in the inscriptions of *taiya* and *taya*, they are certainly, as in Sanskrit, used with a dative signification only; but judging from the analogous employment of the other personal suffixes *maiya* and *shaiya*, as well

¹ Compare *aham*, "I," *vayam*, "self," *ayam*, "this," *vayam*, "we," *yuyam*, "ye," &c.

² See Comp. Gr., s. 326.

³ As *má* and *twá* are used in Sans. equally with *mám* and *twám*, Bopp has suggested that the vowel has been lengthened to compensate for the rejection of the *w*, and that the abbreviated *má* has afterwards reacted on the more complete *mám*, and imparted to it the newly acquired quantity. See Comp. Gr., s. 326.

⁴ *Tai* is the exact orthographical equivalent of *té*, but the *i* cannot be used as a terminal in the old Persian, and hence the more developed form of *taiya*.

⁵ See Comp. Gr., s. 329. Compare also with *mé*, *té*, *sé*, the Latin datives, *mi-hi*, *tí-bi*, *si-bi*.

as from the actual application of the Zend 𐬭𐬀, I believe that they would with equal propriety represent the genitive and instrumental cases, and that as a genitive they might even replace the possessive pronoun.

It is sufficiently remarkable, that there is not a single example in the inscriptions of the employment of the pronoun of the 2nd person in the plural number, although the object of address in more cases than one, is certainly a multitude, rather than an individual¹. Nevertheless, I cannot, on this negative evidence, suppose the language to have been deficient in a correspondent for 𐬭𐬀 or 𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *yújhēm*, "ye." It is more probable, as the admonition or declaration always proceeds from the monarch, that the singular is used for the plural, to mark the inferiority of the parties addressed; and in the event of an inscription being ever found in which the king may address himself directly to the Gods, I should thus expect to find the pronoun in the plural number.

Under the head of *adam*, I have cursorily noticed the connexion which is shown by the pronoun of the 1st person to have existed between the early languages of the Arian and Semitic family. This connexion, however, is even more clearly marked in comparing the various terms employed to express the pronoun of the 2nd person. The true and universal sign of the 2nd person is *t*; in the Arian languages the dental has been united to the vowel *u*, and we have thus, Sanskrit *Tu-am* (त्वं *Twam*), Zend *Túm*; old Pers. *Tuvam*; modern Pers. تو *tu*; Greek *σύ*; Latin *tu*; Goth. "thu;" Germ. "du;" Eng. "thou," &c. In the Semitic languages on the other hand, the article *an*, which is optionally used in the Babylonian, and which unquestionably performs the same grammatical function² as the suffixed *am* of

¹ See particularly the address to the Persian race at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, (Ins. No. 6, l. 56,) where although *martiyá*, "the men," be used in the plur. vocative, the pronoun of the 2nd pers. (in *hauvataiya*), together with the verbs which form the complement of the phrase, are all placed in the sing.

² Bopp observes, (Comp. Gr., s. 348,) "That the pronouns in general are so strongly and vividly personified by themselves, that they are not in need of a very energetic and animated sign of personality; for which reason, although *aham*, *twam*, &c., have a termination, it is not that of the usual nominative, but they appear as neuters in the mere objective or accusative garb." I suspect, however, this so-called neuter termination to be absolutely identical with the prefixed Semitic article.

the Sanskrit, Cuneiform, and Zend, (compare *twam*, *tuvam*, and *túm*,) has been everywhere prefixed to the dental base, and the terminal vowels have been modified to admit of a distinction of gender. The Hebrew masc. אַתָּה ; fem. אַתְּ (or properly אַתְּהָ ;) no doubt, therefore, are contracted from *an-ta* and *an-ti*; as we have the Arab. m. أَنْتَ ; f. أَنْتِ ; Copt. m. ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ; f. ⲁⲛⲟ ; Æthiopic, m. አንተ ; f. አንቲ ; and Syriac, with the dormant *n*, m. ܐܢܬܝ ; f. ܐܢܬܝ . The same pronominal dental occurs also in the 2nd pers. of all Semitic verbs, either prefixed or suffixed, and is likewise of a very general employment for a similar purpose throughout the Arian family of languages. Wherever, indeed, we have a sibilant in the termination of the 2nd pers. sing. of verbs in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, it must be considered a degradation of the primitive dental, (compare Gr. ρῖ or σῖ ;) and of course the aspirate of the Zend and Cuneiform in corresponding terms, is a still later orthographical corruption*.

𐎧𐎠 th.

𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 𐎧𐎠 THAKATÁ, [Behistun, Passim,] *Tunc. Thakátá* must be compared with the Sanskrit तद् , with this difference however, that the former is derived from the compound pronoun तक् , rather than from the simple base *ta*, (neut. तद् ;) and

* I take these Semitic forms from Gesenius Lex., (Eng. Ed., p. 116,) who has compared the dental bases, but who has failed to recognize the prefixed article, (which, however, occurs in the sing. and plur. of all Semitic pronouns of the 1st and 2nd pers.), or to identify it with the suffixed *am* of the Sanskrit and Zend.

* It must be remembered, however, that the application of the dental to the 2nd person is secondary, not primitive, for in its original condition, as a base, it is a demonstrative. In the derivation of the sibilant, (which in the Turkish languages is universally applied to the 2nd pers.) from the demonstrative dental, I follow Gesenius. See his note to ⲁⲛⲟⲕ in the Hebrew Lexicon.

* The common use of the suffix *ka* in Sanskrit is to form a possessive, (comp. *māmaka*, "meus," *tavaka*, "tuus," and the Vedic *asmaka*, *yushmaka*, &c.,) but Wilson defines the suffix in *taka* as a pleonasm; *ka* as a possessive, is no doubt, the original of the Hindustani *ká*, *kí*, *ké*, and is also cognate with the gen. case-ending in Turkish.

made in another passage to include the inhabitants of Margush, Thatagush, and Saka¹, I should suppose the countries of Merv and of the Paropamisus to have been anciently very closely connected; the former, indeed, as far as political government was concerned, being dependent on the latter. There can be little doubt either, but that the *Sarrayûdai* of Herodotus, who are classed in his seventh Satrapy with the Gandarii, the Dadicæ, and the Aparytæ, represent the inhabitants of Thatagush, and as the Dadicæ in another passage of the same author are associated with the Gandarii in a common command, the latter, as I have before shown, dwelling on the banks of the Indus, there is additional reason for believing the province of Thatagush, which is mentioned in the inscriptions, to have extended over the entire mountain range². It is at the same time sufficiently singular that, while the geographical notices both of the Vendidad and of the Bun Dehesh, point to this particular country as the high place of the ancient Zoroastrians³, the name of Thatagush should still admit of so very little direct, or even conjectural illustration.

The Cuneiform  being a regular correspondent for the Devanagari श, the title may be presumed to be identical with the Sanskrit शतगुः, "possessed of a hundred cows;" and to have been given to the country in consequence of the abundance of horned-cattle which it pastured; but with the exception of the solitary notice of the *Sarrayûdai* in Herodotus, and the possible allusion to the same people in the Catace of the Pentin-

¹ Compare Beh. Col. III., par. 3, with Col. II., par. 2.

² Compare lib. III., c. 91, with lib. VII., c. 66; Rennell (Geog. of Her., vol. I., p. 390,) would confine this Satrapy to Margiana and the surrounding districts, but he was misled by his ignorance of the true position of the Gandarii; he does not attempt to identify the Sattagyda.

³ The province of Thatagush is probably represented in the Vendidad by Hæstumat, being the region watered by the Helmand (or Etymander) and its tributaries; but I cannot venture to compare the names, notwithstanding that *th* is a legitimate correspondent for *h*, (comp. *mathishia* and महिष), and that the Median does actually employ an aspirate instead of a dental in expressing the Persian *Thatagush*. I entirely approve of Burnouf's analysis and illustration of Hæstumat. See Yaçna, Notes et Ec., p. 93, sqq. The Paropamisian range in the Bun Dehesh is Mount Arparsîn.

⁴ Wilson compares Satgerhi, but doubtingly, (see As. Res., vol. XV., p. 104.) If the Sâtacas of Wilford (As. Res., vol. VIII., p. 340,) be really found in a Sanskrit geographical series, the assimilation of the name to the Cuneiform Thatagush is probable.

gerian Tables, which is placed to the north of Drangiana, I know not of a single passage in Greek or Latin authors which can be supposed to preserve a trace of the ancient name. About the period, indeed, of the extinction of the Achæmenian monarchy, a tide of immigration appears to have set in from the eastward, which continued for many centuries in a series of waves to overflow the Paropamisian mountains, and which, as it discharged its shoals of population upon Eastern Persia, along the valleys of the rivers descending from the great range, obliterated the old territorial and ethnic land-marks, and caused the nomenclature of each tract to vary according to the shifting footsteps of the tribes. The Dadicæ of Herodotus were perhaps among the earliest of the immigrants. Pressed upon by the Sacæ, they followed along the course of the Helmand, Heri-rúd, and Murgh-áb, had reached the skirts of the mountains in the time of Ptolemy, who places Tatacene between Aria and Drangiana, and were subsequently distributed over the plains as Táts and Tájiks¹. The Sacæ in the same way, who were their successors, had given the name of *Σακαστηνῇ* in the time of Isidore to the *Thatagush* of the inscriptions, but shortly afterwards they themselves were expelled by fresh colonists from the mountains, and permanently settled in Sagastán or Seistán, on the lower Helmand². I will not pretend at present to trace the steps of the multitudinous hordes who followed; the *Ζαόροι*, *Ίωροι*, *Κοζόλοι*, *Κορσοί*, and the hundred tribes who are mentioned by Chinese, Arabic, and Armenian authors³;

¹ The Tájiks are usually identified with the Dahæ, but I think wrongly. Throughout Eastern Persia, *Tát* and *Tájik* are synonymous terms applied to the agricultural peasantry in contradistinction to the pastoral and foreign nomades, and it is, I think, therefore, a fair induction to refer them to the *Δαδικαί*, who colonized *Τατακίην*: see Ptol., l. 6, c. 19. In Chinese history, indeed, a distinction is recognized between the *Tahia* or *Dahæ* and the *Taio-chi* or *Tájika*.

² The *Σακαστηνῇ* of Isidore, it must be remembered, is distinguished from Drangiana, and cannot therefore represent the Sagastán of Persian history. Its title of *Πραιτικήν*, also, necessarily confines it to the mountains, and the names of several of its towns are, I believe, to be recognized in Oriental geography among the dependencies of Ghúr.

³ The *Zaori* and *Iori* are mentioned by Dionysius in his *Bassarica*, l. 26, v. 166, and perhaps the *Ξούθοι* of the same author may be referred to the inhabitants of *Thatagush*. I take the names of *Kozol* and *Kors* from the coins of Kadaphes and Kadphises; Khojeristán, or the country of the Kozols, is mentioned by Mos. Chor., and is the Khujestán of the Bun Dehes. The name however is now lost, as is also that of Ghurshistán, but the positions on the Upper Murgháb and Helmand may be verified from the notices of the Arab geographers. I take this opportunity of remarking, that while Sanskrit and Chinese authorities have

that they were in many instances numerically strong, and of some political weight, may be inferred from the traces they have left of their names in Zabulistán, Khorassán (anciently Khoristán), Khojeristán, Ghurshistán, &c., but their ethnographical history is involved in much obscurity, and its discussion would be foreign moreover to the present argument, which merely aims at explaining the reason of the disappearance of the title of Thatagush from ancient as well as modern geography.

𑎧𑎡𑎢𑎣 THADAYA, [Ins. No. 6, l. 58, p. 310,] (*Ne*) *pereat*.

I suppose the root *thad* to be identical with the Sans. शद्, "to perish," but if this assimilation be admitted we must consider the verb to be conjugated in the old Persian according to the tenth class, instead of following the first and sixth classes as in Sanskrit, for there can be no doubt but that the termination in *aya* is the conjugational suffix. I have already more than once alluded to the distinction between the suffixes in *iya* and *aya*, the one being employed for the fourth and the other for the tenth class; and I may add, in reference to *thadaya*, that the rule in Sanskrit which elongated the radical vowel *a* in the special tenses of roots of the latter class is not of universal application, and that *thad*, accordingly, may be compared with the Sanskrit conjugation of such roots as भक्ष्, "to eat;" कश्, "to tell;" गण्, "to count;" रह्, "to leave;" गद्, "to thunder, &c., in all of which the short *a* retains its primitive quantity throughout the special tenses. In *thadaya*, then, for *thadayat*, I suppose that we have the 3rd pers. sing. of the act. imperf. of *thad*, conjugated with the suffix in *aya*, and that the temporal augment is dropped after the interdictory particle *má*, in order to give the meaning of dissuasion without reference to time; *má thadaya* signifying "let it not perish," as I have already explained *má tarsam* to mean "let me not fear¹."

been exhausted in the illustration of Arianian ethnography, Pehlevi, Armenian, and Arabic sources of evidence have been almost wholly neglected; yet the Bun Deheesh, Moses of Chorene, and the early Arabs have the most valuable notices, and their rigid examination is indispensable to a complete enquiry.

¹ There is a difficulty however with regard to voice; Westergaard observes, that शद् is conjugated in the middle voice in the special tenses, and in the active

𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀮 THRAD(A), [Col. IV., l. 4, 5, p. 240, l. 41, p. 246, l. 45, p. 247, l. 52, p. 249, l. 60, p. 252.] *Perfectio*. In the notes appended to the second paragraph of the fourth column at Behistun, I have adverted to the extreme difficulty of rendering the phrase *hamahyáya thrada*, so as to reconcile with its application to the context, the etymological import of the terms, and their various conditions of grammatical employment; and after much further consideration, and with the improved acquaintance with the old Persian language which I have acquired in compiling the present Vocabulary, I still find myself as incompetent as ever to deal with this obscure expression. As the Cuneiform 𑀘𑀓 replaces the palatal sibilant and the aspirate as well as the dental, *thrad(a)* might perhaps be orthographically compared with *शरद्*, "the autumn," or *अन्*!, the particle of belief, or even with *हृद्*, "the mind," but I cannot obtain a suitable meaning from any of these equivalents, and I am obliged therefore to fall back upon the very doubtful derivation which I have before given from *चद्*, "to do" or "perform," conjecturing the name, which may signify "performance," to be a neuter in silent *d*, following the ninth class of the eighth declension of Wilkins'.

in all the others, (Radices, p. 177,) and the signification moreover of *thadaya* in this passage is reflective and not transitive; but *asadayat* will represent in Sanskrit neither an imperfect nor an aorist in the middle voice, and I am doubtful therefore if we may not rather have a passive aorist, *thad(a)ya* being for *sadi*, as I shall presently show *athahya* in the same tense to be used for *asansi*. (The signification also of "let it not be lost," would be equally applicable with "let it not perish."

¹ I was long inclined to translate *hamahyáya thrada*, "true in every thing," supposing *thrada* to be the connecting orthographical link between "truth," and *अन्*, a term, which by another modification of the initial has also given rise to the Latin *cred-o*; but I found the grammatical application in some passages to present an insuperable difficulty. Another conjecture which has occurred to me is, that the allusion may be to the tri-lingual writing, *thrada* standing for *त्रेधा*, "in three ways;" but this explanation, also, I have on due consideration rejected. The Devanagari *त्रा*, which occurs in *चद्*, is, as we know, generally represented in the inscriptions by 𑀮𑀭, but still the reading of *Mithra* and *Kshathrita* shows us that the Zend law of aspiration was also sometimes acknowledged, and there is no orthographical difficulty therefore in comparing 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀮 with *चद्*.

If this explanation, however, (which is, I confess, to me anything but satisfactory) be admitted, we must of course read *thrad* instead of *thrada*, both in the nominative and accusative case, supposing the silent *d* to be preserved as a terminal where it is a radical letter, (compare also the nominatives *kauf* and *daraug*); and in Col. IV., line 45, where *thrada* would appear to be a genitive for *thradas*, we must further believe the old Persian theme to have differed from the Sanskrit in retaining the sonant dental in the oblique cases instead of converting it to a surd of the same class. I have so little confidence at the same time in the meaning which I have thus given to *hamahydya thrad(a)*, that I will abstain from any further attempt at illustration.

𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎶𐎵𐎴 𐎶𐎵𐎴 𐎶𐎵𐎴 𐎶𐎵𐎴 THASTANIYA, [Col. I., l. 53, 54, p. 204,] *Stans, sistens*. I have no great hesitation in identifying this word as the present participle, or the present gerund of a root answering to the Sanskrit 𑖦𑖩, the reduplicate letter, which in Sanskrit is the dental *t*, in Latin a sibilant, and in Greek and Zend an aspirate, (compare 𑖦𑖩𑖦𑖩 *sisto*, ἵστημι, and 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀) being represented by the Cuneiform 𐎧𐎡𐎴, and thus supplying an important link in the chain of orthographical mutation. But, although, according to this explanation, the *thastaniya* of the inscriptions will be intermediate between the Sanskrit 𑖦𑖩𑖦𑖩 and the Latin *sistens*, it exhibits a purer form than is found in any of the cognate languages, in so far as it preserves unchanged the vowel of the reduplicate syllable¹. I have already noticed the peculiar ending of the words which represent the present participle in the old Persian, under the head *Chartaniya*, and I shall submit any observations that may be necessary regarding the employment of the root, when I come to consider the substantive *stánam*. It only remains therefore to add, that as the verbal formations in *aniya* are used in almost every instance in the

¹ Bopp (Comp. Gr., Eng. Ed., vol. I., p. 111,) assumes that the Sans. *tsthámi* is a degradation of a primitive *tasthámi*, and he explains the substitution of *i* for *a*, "on the ground that the reduplicative syllable, which is seeking generally for relief from weight, and therefore converting long into short vowels, may not mix up the heaviest among the short vowels with the weight derived from position." See Comp. Gr., s. 482, and for further remarks, s. 508.

inscriptions without the support of the substantive verb, they may perhaps be considered as independent gerunds of present time, rather than as *bonâ fide* participles.

𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎧𐎡𐎴 THAH. A root which is certainly identical with the Sanskrit शस्, and the Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀, "to say," and which by the strengthening of the aspirate to a guttural, (a change that occurs even in the Zend derivatives) has produced the Persian سخن *sukhn*, "speech;" the Germ. *sagen*; Scandinavian *saga*; Eng. "sing," "song," &c. The verb occurs in the inscriptions under the following forms:—

THÁTIYA, 3rd pers. sing. act. imperf. [passim,] *Dicit*.

ATHAHAM, 1st pers. sing. act. imperf. [passim,] *Dixi*.

ATHAHA, 3rd pers. sing. act. imperf. [passim,] *Dixit*.

THAHYÁMAHYA, 1st pers. plur. pres. passive, [Col. I., l. 7, p. 196,] *Appellamur*.

ATHAHYA, 3rd pers. sing. pass. aorist, [Col. I., l. 20, p. 198, l. 23, 24, p. 199,] *Dictum est*.

THÁ ----- (?) [Col. IV., l. 49, p. 247,] ----- (?)

THÁH ----- (?) [Col. IV., l. 58, p. 251,] *Commemoraberis?*

Thátiya for the 3rd pers. sing. of the act. present is undoubtedly an irregular form, so irregular indeed, that notwithstanding the uniform applicability of the meaning, "he says," we might still doubt its identity, did we not find that the Median translations at Behistun, substituting the present for the past, make use very frequently of a common term to express the Persian *thátiya* and *athaha*. Under what particular process the

¹ The usual Sanskrit form is शस्, and Wilson admits the signification of "speaking," only when the root is preceded by 𐎧𐎡𐎴. Westergaard, however, gives many examples of शस्, with the meaning of "telling" or "speaking," (see Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 312,) and Burnouf comparing 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀, (which, however, is generally written 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀) with the Sans. शस्, simply translates the root by the French "dire." See Yaçna, p. 29, where the Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *cañh*, is also referred to the same root. Further remarks on the roots शस् and शस् are given by Burnouf in the Avant-propos to the Yaçna, p. 21.

radical *h* has been elided in the Cuneiform *thātiya*, I am unable to guess, but it is certainly owing to this elision that the *a* has been elongated (*tha+atiya* becoming *thātiya*); for the verb is of the first class, and I do not believe any other example is to be found of such an essential deviation from Sanskrit orthography¹.

Athaham and *athaha* for the 1st and 3rd persons singular of the act. imperf. are regularly formed, and represent the Sanskrit अहंस् and अहंस्ते .

For the 1st pers. plur. of the present passive, *thahyámahaya* is, perhaps, a more correct orthography than *thahyámahya*, as it is hardly probable that the additional *a* which is pre-inserted before the terminal *i* in the primary forms of the middle and passive voices in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek*, should have lapsed in the language of the inscriptions; and orthographically, indeed, although <३< ४< when it replaces स्स or सि, may be read with some confidence as *hya**, yet as the substitute of हे (*hé=hai*), it must necessarily, I think, be pronounced with the fuller form of *haya*. In comparing *thahyámah(a)ya*, however, with शंस्यामहे *sansyámahe*, the most interesting thing is to observe the close affinity of the Sanskrit and the old Persian, and their common distinction from the Zend and Greek; the *y* which is appended to the root is of course the passive characteristic, and the class-syllable *a*, upon which it opens, is elongated, according to Bopp, by the weight of the following *m**, but the personal termination *mahaya* or महे, it must be remembered, is not a primary but a secondary

¹ The elongation of the *a* is considered by Bopp in many cases to be equivalent to the *guna* of the other vowels, (*a* + *a* becoming *ā* as *a* + *i* becomes *ē* and *a* + *u* is equal to *o*), and this *guna* is found in the old Persian forms of the pres. tense of the first class, such as *gaubataiya*, "it is called," *vainataiya*, "it is seen," *tar-satiya*, "he fears;" but at the same time, as the Sanskrit does not lengthen the radical short *a* in roots of the first class, neither can I suppose such a rule to have applied in the language of the inscriptions; the lengthening of the radical *a* in certain roots of the fourth class in Sanskrit, appears to be owing to the weight of the following *m*. I allude to the examples given by Wilkins, s. 248.

² See Bopp's excellent observations on this subject, *Comp. Gr.*, s. 466.

* As in the genitive case-ending of the first declension, and the termination of the 2nd pers. sing. of the pres. tense of verbs.

⁴ Bopp's observation (s. 434) refers particularly to the elongation of the class-syllable *a* in the active voice, but is of course equally applicable to the middle and passive.

form¹, and hence the identity of the Cuneiform and Devanagari alphabetical power. Founding on the corresponding terminations, which are *maidhé*, in Zend, and *meta* in Greek, Professor Bopp, long ago, determined that the Sanskrit *महे* was a mutilation of *मधे*², and, although this is, I believe, the only instance in the inscriptions in which the Cuneiform <𐎠𐎡> will be thus found to replace a primitive *ध*, yet the frequent examples of the converse mutation may be held to support his explanation³. At any rate, if the Sanskrit *महे* had been a primitive form, we could hardly by possibility have had the Cuneiform equivalent of *mahaya*. The Devanagari *ह* would in all likelihood have been represented by <𐎠𐎡> or <𐎠𐎡> or <𐎠𐎡>.

The term *athahya* certainly signifies "it was said," and as it cannot represent the imperfect *अशस्यत्*, (we have, indeed, an example of the regular passive imperfect in *akun(a)vayátá*.) I am obliged to explain it as the 3rd pers. of the aorist, notwithstanding that the radical vowel retains its quantity, and that in the similar aorist form of the passive voice, *adáriya*, the Sanskrit termination in *i* is replaced by *iya*. We must remember, indeed, that we are not without precedents, even in Sanskrit, for the retention of the short vowel in the passive aorist, (compare *अजनि*, "he was born," *अबधि*, "he was killed";) and that,

¹ While I thus willingly concede the originality of the passive ending in *mahaya*, I should still consider the active plur. termination of the 1st pers. in the possible term *thahámahya* to be *amahya*, for *asmasi*, the true and original form of the 1st. pers. plur. present tense of the substantive verb. See above under the head *Jadiyámiya*.

² Bopp ably illustrates this subject, Comp. Gr., s. 472; but I do not find any etymological explanation of the ending in *मधे madhé*.

³ Generally, I think, in grammatical adjuncts, the dental is an older form than the aspirate, as in the adverbial suffix of place, and certainly in the 2nd pers. sing. of the imperat.; but on the other hand, *ad-am* for the pron. of the 1st pers. sing., is undoubtedly a later orthography than *ah-am*, and *daraya*, *dastayá* and *guda*, are also, it may be presumed, degradations of the Sanskrit forms *हरि*, *हस्य*, and *गुह*.

⁴ See Wilkins, s. 601. These however are, I believe, the only examples

although the terminal **इ** is represented by *iya* after other consonants, owing to the repugnance of the old Persian to admit compound groupings, yet the aspirate possesses a peculiar aptitude for combination, and *hya* therefore is always used for **ह्य** in the 2nd person singular of the present tense of verbs¹. I propose, accordingly, to compare *athahya* with **अथाहि**, which, although not in use, will admit of a possible formation.

The imperfect word which appears to commence with 𐎧𐎡𐎴 in line 49 of the 4th Col., at Behistun, is in all probability a derivative from the same root *thak*, which I am now considering, but the passage is too much mutilated, and the sense is too obscure to justify me in attempting its restoration*. I have less hesitation in completing the other imperfect word commencing with 𐎧𐎡𐎴 𐎠𐎫𐎲 in line 58 of the same column, for the sense evidently requires a term signifying "thou shalt not be recorded," and *tháhyáhya*, as the 2nd pers. sing. subjunctive present of the passive would give that precise meaning*. At the same time, it may hardly be allowable to analyze a term for the orthography of which we are thus merely dependent on a conjectural restoration.

𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭮𐭲 THÁIGARCHAISH, [Col. II., l. 46, 47, p. 220.] *Thegarst*. The name of a month in the old Persian calendar, which here occurs as the gen. case of a masc. theme in *i*. As the Median employs an aspirate to express the

which occur of such a formation in Sanskrit. In every other case the short *a* is elongated, and the other vowels are affected with the *vriiddhi* in the pass. aorist.

¹ I may instance also the optional reading of *ahiyáyá* and *ahyáyá*, as a proof of the tendency of the letter *h* to coalesce immediately with the *y*.

^a See the notes to clause 3, para. 8, Column IV. at Behistun, p. 248.

* The appearance of the **𑀧𑀸𑀓** however, as the second character, is suspicious. The elongation might, it is true, distinguish the subjunctive (which would be used in the complement to a condition) from the indic. mood in the passive voice, but we have no authority for such a construction. It might also be used to give a causal signification to the verb, the etymological meaning of the passive verb *thāhya*, being "to be spoken of," while that of *thahya*, is simply "to be said" or "called."

initial letter of the Persian word, and as the month in question may be referred, from its relative position among the series of names preserved at Behistun, to the winter season, I am almost inclined to derive the term from the Sanskrit हिमकर, "cold," supposing the nasal coalescing in the first place with the guttural, and thus forming *hinkara*, to have been subsequently lost in the Cuneiform, as the first element of a groupe, and seeing in the first syllable the *vridhhi*, which is also met with in many of the derivatives from the Sanskrit हिम. The guttural, indeed, may have been altered from the surd to the sonant grade by the absorption of the nasal, but I am unable to offer any reasonable explanation of the suffix in *chi*. Several other examples occur in the inscriptions of the genitive of masculine themes in *i*, such as *Fravartaish*, *Bágayádaish*, and in the latter term, as the 𐎠 necessarily opens on the *a*, we have a determinate proof of the *guna* being introduced before the case-ending in the old Persian, as it also is in Zend and Sanskrit; *aish*, in fact, being the exact equivalent of 𐎠𐎡 or 𐎠𐎡𐎢.

𐎠𐎡𐎢 𐎠𐎡𐎢 𐎠𐎡𐎢 𐎠𐎡𐎢 𐎠𐎡𐎢 𐎠𐎡𐎢 THURAVÁHARA-HYA, [Col. II., l. 36, p. 218, &c.,] *Suravaris*. This is the name of another of the old Persian months, which probably belonged to the spring, as it intervened between the intercalary month Anámaka and that of Garmapada, the latter, from its etymological import, being necessarily included in the hot season; 𐎠𐎡 in Sanskrit is a name for "the sun," and 𐎠𐎡𐎢 signifies "a day," but I know not if we are justified in assuming this derivation for the Thuraváhara of the inscriptions. I cannot pretend indeed, at present, to give any illustration of the primitive Persian calendar. The names are undoubtedly more ancient than those of the Zend Avesta, (which, indeed, are taken from the genii of the hybrid Chaldeo-Persic theogony). They are probably more ancient than any nomenclature which is preserved in Sanskrit literature, or than the titles of the months of the Cappadocians which have been handed down to us by the Greeks. They bear internal marks of

Sanskrit ष, which is the sign of the 2nd pers. of the middle voice, instead of comparing it directly with ण, the regular ending in Sanskrit of the 3rd pers. of all verbs of the active voice². It is impossible, I think, that *tuva* could orthographically represent the syllable *sva*, while a Devanagari ण could be expressed in the old Persian in no other manner; and moreover it must be remembered, that forms in *tuva* are always used in the inscriptions with a nominative *A'uramazdá*, the phrases, "may Ormazd protect," "may he prosper," "may he bring help," &c., being evidently considered more respectful than if the Supreme Angel were addressed in the 2nd person.

I may add, also, that in the particular passage where we have *danautuva* or *ardanautuva*, the verbs in the other clauses invoking a series of blessings are used throughout in the 3rd person.

𐎠𐎡𐎴 DAR. A root answering to the Sanskrit ध, "to hold" or "possess," which becomes 𐎠𐎡𐎴 *dērē*, in Zend, and 𐎠𐎡𐎴 *dar*, in Persian. The verb is both of the first and of the tenth class as in Sanskrit³, and is found in the inscriptions under the following forms:—

DÁRAYÁMIYA, [Col. I., l. 26, p. 200,] *Habeo—teneo*.

ADÁRAYA, [Col. I., l. 85, p. 211, &c., &c.,] *Tenuit—habitarit*?

ADÁRI? (for ADÁRAYA,) [Ins. No. 6, l. 22, p. 294,] *Tenuere—habuere*.

¹ See Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 248. Professor Lassen, however, appears to have been led into this error by taking the letter 𐎠𐎡𐎴 for *dā* instead of *t*.

² The *t* in this suffix is of course the demonstrative dental applied to the 3rd person, but I know not the grammatical value of the *u*. I should have supposed, also, the *rw* of the Greek imperative to be equivalent to the Sanskrit transitive ending in *tu*, in the same way as *rw* in the middle voice would represent the Sanskrit and old Persian *tām*, but Professor Bopp refers both one termination and the other to the Vedic 𐎠𐎡𐎴. See Comp. Gr., s. 470.

³ The verb in Sanskrit is also sometimes used in the sixth class, but the inscriptions are deficient in any example of this form of conjugating the root.

⁴ Westergaard gives the middle imperfect 𐎠𐎡𐎴 in the Rig Veda with the sense of "they lived;" but Rosen translates "obtinuerunt." R. V. Hymn. 20. l. 8. See Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 63, and Rig Vedæ Spec. p. 30.

ADÁRAYA, [Col. I., l. 26, p. 200,] *Potitus essem.*

ADÁRIYA, [Col. II., l. 75, p. 223, and l. 90, p. 226,] *Retinebatur.*

ADARSHIYA, [Ins. No. 4, l. 8, p. 279,] *Potitus sum.*

Dárayámiya for the 1st pers. sing. of the act. present of the tenth class exactly answers to the Sanskrit धारयामि¹, the elongation of the *a* in the first syllable standing for the vridhhi of the Sanskrit verb, and the following *aya* being the conjugational suffix.

The 3rd pers. sing. also, of the act. imperf. of the same class, *adáraya*, is the regular correspondent of the Sanskrit अधारयन्, and the term at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, which in Westergaard's copy appears as *adári*, but which should, I think, be written *adáraya*, with a terminal |< instead of |², will represent with equal closeness the 3rd pers. plural अधारयन्³.

Where the term *adáraya*, however, occurs in the 9th para. of the 1st Col. at Behistun, it must be necessarily identified as the 1st pers. sing. of the middle aorist of the tenth conjugation, and the termination in *aya* must stand for the personal-ending of that voice (ē=ai⁴) rather than for the conjugational suffix. In Sanskrit, indeed, verbs of the tenth class and causals, while they usually retain the elongation of the radical vowel in the aorist of both voices, lose the class syllable or affix in अय्, and I believe, therefore, that अधारे for the 1st pers. sing. of that tense in the middle voice of the tenth class would be an equally legitimate formation with the अधृषि, which must be in use for the corresponding form of the first class⁵. If, however, there were in the

¹ For observations on the elongation of the class-syllable *a*, and on the so-called personal termination, see the note to *jadyámiya*.

² See the notes to the third para. of Insc. No. 6, p. 295.

³ The personal-endings of the sing. and plur. *t* and *n*, are of course elided in the old Persian as silent terminals.

⁴ Bopp, in his excellent chapter on the Medial Terminations, (Comp. Gr., s. 466 to s. 480,) satisfactorily explains the general substitution of ē (=ai) for amé (=amai) in the 1st pers. sing. of the middle voice.

⁵ In treating of the active aorist of the tenth class, Bopp observes, that the syllable of reduplication or the base-syllable must be long, and I imagine that the latter condition applies also to the middle voice. See s. 580 of the Comp. Gr.

language of the inscriptions such a tense as the subjunctive aorist, which is far from improbable, I should prefer that explanation for *adāraya*, as the conditional adverb *yātā*, "until," which precedes it, would be more appropriately joined to the subjunctive than to the indicative mood. I may add, also, that the reflective power of the middle voice is sufficiently apparent in the application of *adāraya*, for *yātā adāraya* means "until I had gained (for myself.)"

Adāriya is, I think, undoubtedly the 3rd person singular of the passive aorist, the Sanskrit correspondent being अघारि, and the euphonic *ya* being necessarily superadded, as the old Persian will not admit of a termination in the vowel. I do not find any explanation in Bopp of the lapse of the personal termination in this form of the verb, and Wilkins, comparing the passive aorist with his tenth mode, which properly belongs to the middle voice, contents himself with observing that in the 3rd pers. sing. ई has been substituted for ए; but that the loss of the *t* must have been very ancient, is shown not only by the accordance of the Sanskrit and the old Persian, but by the agreement also of the Zend, in which Lassen has found the corresponding form of *ērēnāvi*, from *ērē* with the suffix of the fifth conjugation¹. Under the head *athakya*, (p. 179) I have shown that, although *adāriya* must in the inscriptions orthographically represent *adhāri*, yet the same termination in *i* may be contracted into *ya* after an aspirate, from the facility which that consonant affords for combination.

The only other form of the verb that occurs in the inscriptions is *adarshiya*, which Professor Lassen has already compared with *adharshi*², the 1st person sing. of the middle aorist, designated by Wilkins as the tenth mode. I should suppose, however, that

Although, indeed, I cannot find any example of अघारे, if the verb be of the tenth class it would seem to be a regular middle form, belonging to the ninth mode of Wilkins. Compare in Wilkins's Gram., s. 440, 444, and 455.

¹ See Wilkins's Gr., s. 601.

² Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 249. Zeitschrift, p. 527.

³ See Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 44 and 247. Zeitschrift, p. 525. Bopp has some admirable remarks on this form of the aorist in his Comp. Gr., s. 542 to s. 547, and he clearly shows its connexion with Latin perfects in *si*; compare *scripsi*, *vexi*, *rexi*, &c.

although the root नी ending in a long vowel may admit the *guna* in the 3rd and 1st persons अनेह and अनेषि, the short vowel would be preserved intact in अधृत and अधृषि, as in fact it is preserved in अकृत and अकृषि; and I consider, therefore, the substitution of *dar* for *dhri* to be the mere orthographical artifice by which the Cuneiform alphabet compensated for its want of the Devanagari ऋ¹. Westergaard gives अधृत as the 3rd pers. of the middle aorist of धृ in the first class, and I accordingly assign the 1st person *adarshiya* to the same conjugation; but I am not prepared to say that there is any real distinction of meaning, according as the root may follow this class, or be of the ordinary tenth conjugation. The verb is used, I may add, with a reflective application, and hence the employment of the middle instead of the active voice.

From this same root, *Dar*, conjugated in the tenth class, is undoubtedly derived the name of Darius, and I suspect the termination to be nothing more than a euphonic strengthening of the *unadi* affix in *u*, though it is, to say the least of it, a strange anomaly to find the conjugational characteristic in a derivative noun². The name occurs in several cases:—

𐎠 𐎡 𐎢𐎪 𐎧𐎺𐎠 𐎧𐎺𐎠 𐎧𐎺𐎠 𐎧𐎺𐎠

DĀR(A)YAVUSH, nom., [Passim.] *Darius*.

DĀR(A)YAVA(H)USH, gen., [Passim.] *Darii*.

DĀR(A)YAVUM, acc., [Passim.] *Darium*.

Herodotus expressly states this title to mean ἐρξέλης, “the powerful³.” Others translate it φρόνιμος, “the intelligent,” or

¹ This substitution, in fact, is precisely similar to the corresponding Zend orthography of 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀 *dēřē*. It must be observed, however, that the primitive short vowel of the Sanskrit still retains, notwithstanding the Cuneiform mutation, its power of aspirating the following sibilant. See Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 63.

² It is owing to this presumed identification of the Cuneiform 𐎧𐎺𐎠 with the conjugational suffix of the tenth class, that I write *Dārāya* instead of *Dārya*, but at the same time I employ a parenthesis to show that the reading is doubtful.

³ Lib. VI., c. 98; ἐρξέλης is Ionic for ἐρξίας from ἔργω. Donnegan gives πρακτικός as the equivalent.

⁴ Hesychius in voce Δαρείος.

πολεμικός, "the warlike". Etymologically however, it simply signifies "the possessor," and the quality or object possessed must be left to conjecture.—The Greeks usually employed the corrupt reading of Δαρείος, but we have a purer form in the accusative Δαριάην, which is preserved by Strabo², and the Hebrew דַּרְיָוֶשׁ, *Daryavesh*, represents almost exactly the true and primitive orthography. The Medes and Babylonians, also, reproduced the original Persian title as nearly as their respective alphabetical systems would admit, and in the modern corruption even of دَرَاب *Dáráb*, although the inflexion has been dropped and the conjugational suffix suppressed, the Cuneiform 𐎣𐎶𐎠𐎺 is still preserved in the terminal labial. Of all the Achæmenian names this title alone appears to have survived the dynasty without much disfigurement. The King of Media, at any rate, who supported Tigranes in his great battle with Lucullus, had the name of Darius³, and that the old pronunciation had not been essentially altered as late even as the first century of our era is evident from the comparison which Strabo makes between the Greek and Persian orthography. I suppose, however, that under the Lower Arsacides the historical knowledge of the early empire was almost entirely lost, and that when the Magi accordingly under Ardeshr Bábegán undertook to recover the scattered Zoroastrian fragments, and to compile a full and complete liturgy for their renovated faith, the name even of the great *Dár(a)yavush* of the Behistun and Persepolitan Inscriptions was no longer known to them. His memory, as the reformer of the national religion, was still held in veneration, but by a strange error of nomenclature which can only be explained, I think, by the influence of Greek literature, the patronymic Vishtáspa was substituted for the proper name of the king⁴; and the title of

¹ Etym. Mag. in voce.

² Δαριάην, however, is a correction of Saumaise's for Δαριάκην, which occurs in all the MSS. of Strabo, c. XVI., p. 785; and Salm. Ex. Plin., p. 405. Gesevius proposes a further correction of Δαριάβην; but this is quite unnecessary, while Lassen (Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 9,) writes Δαριάκης in the nom. I think it very possible that Strabo may really have written Δαριάκην, for the guttural was a regular Parthian euphonic suffix.

³ He is named by Plutarch in his Life of Lucullus, and by Dio Cassius.

⁴ That the Zend writings, in their present state, are as old at any rate as the Sassanians, may be inferred from the testimony of Ammianus, (lib. XXIII., c. 61), and Agathias (lib. II., c. 24), who both connect Hystaspes (the Vishtáspa of

Dár(a)yavush, corrupted probably in the popular speech of that age to *Daráb*, was appropriated to Darius Codomannus, and to an immediate predecessor of the same name upon the throne, whose history must be considered purely fabulous. I am ignorant from what source Anquetil has drawn the Zend orthography of *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *Añtarē-áfsh*; it certainly is not found in the Zend Avesta, and if it ever were in use among the Parsis of India¹, it must be regarded as a forced Zend trans-

lation, of the Persian *داراب* *Daráb*, which, the original etymology being lost, might be supposed to signify "on the water²."

When the latter part of the Pehlevi Bun Dehesh was composed, the name exhibited the same form of *Dárá* by which it is usually known at the present day³, and it is probable, therefore, that the less mutilated reading of *Dáráb* has been preserved through a Pazend or Pársi medium.

There is a remarkable circumstance connected with the declension of the noun *Dár(a)yavush* to which I have previously alluded in the Supplementary Note on the Alphabet, but which still requires further explanation in this place. As a masculine theme in *u*, the genitive should of course be formed by the mere introduction of the *guna*, as from *Kurush* we have *Kuraush*, and from *Bábirush*, *Bábiraus*⁴. The Cuneiform alphabet, however,

the Zend Avesta,) with the establishment of the later Magism. Ammianus does not question but that this Hystaspes was the father of the great Darius, but Agathias notices the uncertainty of the identification. In the Zend fragments, also, it is interesting to observe that Vishtáspa is the latest Achæmenian king whose name occurs, and hence may be derived an argument that the hymns and prayers really date from that epoch.

¹ Burnouf has well exposed this spurious derivation of the name of Darius, in his Mem. on the Hamadan Inscriptions, p. 73; but I am not sure that Anquetil did not fabricate the reading, to suit his own conceit that the etymology must be necessarily sought in the Zend language. His words at any rate are ambiguous, and he quotes no authority. See his Memoir on the Zend, Mém. de l'Acad., tom. LVI. p. 199 and 241, 12mo Edit.

² The Persian fables depending on this derivation, are, I consider, unworthy of notice.

³ My copy of the Bun Dehesh, which is much more complete than that translated by Anquetil, gives *Dárá* for the one Darius, and *Dárái Dárhán* for the other.

⁴ In these terms the introduction of the *guna* is shown by the employment of

by a deficiency as I think in its structure, possessed no secondary form for the *v* or *w*, and as orthographically therefore *Dár(a)-yavush* could not be distinguished from *Dár(a)yavaush*¹, it was obliged to employ an aspirate in the genitive to mark the introduction of the *guna*. This aspirate, accordingly, possessing no grammatical value, and probably not intended for articulation, I have placed in a parenthesis. The accusative *Dár(a)yavum* is again regularly formed and requires no illustration.

𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 DARAGAM, [Col. IV., l. 56, p. 250, and l. 75, p. 254.] *Longum*. This is an adjective in the neuter gender used adverbially. Its origin must be referred to the Sanskrit root दृग्, "to lengthen," but it may be more immediately compared with the Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 *darēga*, which is of very common employment²; as well as with the Persian درنگ *darang*, where the nasal is interposed before the guttural agreeably to the genius of the language, and also with دراز *daráz*, "long," which in Pazend would be undoubtedly written *daraj*³. I am not aware that a cognate term is employed in Greek or Latin, or in any other of the Arian languages. It was peculiar, perhaps, to the Perso-Sanskrit family, but in these tongues was of extensive application.

𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, which necessarily requires an *a* (or an *i*) to follow it, instead of 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, which with the same uniformity requires to be followed by *u*.

¹ That is, the letter 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 will coalesce indifferently with the *a* and *u* and 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 may be thus read either *vu* or *vau*. Strictly speaking there is a secondary form of 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, namely 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎, but that character is exclusively allotted to combination with the vowel *i*, and could not therefore be employed in the word under discussion.

² For a full examination of the etymology of the Zend *darēga*, see Burnouf's *Yaçna*, p. 387; he supposes 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 to be a secondary form of 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 *drīh*; and refers *darēga* to another supposed secondary form 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 *drīgh*.

³ The superlative 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬌𐬎 *drájišta*, does actually occur in Zend. See *Yaçna*, p. 389.

𐎠 𐎡 𐎢

DARAYA-HYÁ, [Col. I., l. 15, p. 197,] *Maris, quasi maritima*.

DARAYA-M, [Col. V., l. 24, p. 259,] *Mare*.

PÁRA-DARAYA, [Ins. No. 6, l. 28, 29, p. 294,] *Transmarini*.

The Cuneiform *daraya*, "the sea," is derived from the Sans.

हृत्, "green," and answers to the Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌, *zarayō*, Pehlevi *zaré*, and Persian دریا *daryā*¹. It is possible even that the Greek *θάλασσα* may be a term of cognate origin, the termination in *assa* or *atta*, being the Chaldee feminine characteristic which occurs in the *Θαλάθ* of Berosus, and the substitution of *θαλ* (from *θαλλω*, "to be green,") for *dar* being entirely agreeable to the laws of Greek orthography². With the primitive signification of "green," compare likewise the Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *zairi*; Latin "*vireo*," "*viridis*" (where the digamma takes the place of the aspirate);

Persian زار *zár* in مرغ زار *murgh-zár*, "pasture land;" نی زار *nai zár*, "a place of green reeds," &c.; also, زرد *zard*, "yellow," a meaning which equally applies to *hari*³. *Darayahyá* is undoubtedly the genitive case of a masc. theme in short *a*, but according to a system of construction, which is very frequent in the inscriptions⁴, it is used as an adjective of attribution; *tyiya darayahyá*, "which are of the sea," being employed, as I think, to denote the insular possessions of the Greeks, in contradistinction to the *tyiya 'ushkahyá*, "which are of the dry land," or their continental settlements.

Where we have *abiya darayam* in the 5th Column at Behistun, the writing is too mutilated to admit of connected inter-

¹ For a full and satisfactory examination of the Zend *zarayo*, see Burnouf's *Yaçna*, Notes et Eclair., p. 97.

² *Εἶναι δὲ τοῦτο χαλδαῖσιν μὲν Θαλάθ, ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ μεθερμηνεύεσθαι θάλασσα*.—Syncellus, p. 23. This extract from Berosus is preserved by Alex. Polyhistor.

³ Burnouf has compared most of these terms in his Commentary on the *Yaçna*, sur l'Alphab. Zend, p. 81, n. 32, and he has even ventured to include in his list the Greek *ὠχρός*.

⁴ Compare *karáhya maná*, "my forces;" *khshatram tya Bábirauna*, "the Babylonian crown," (where the locat. is used for the genit.) *hyá amákhham tumá*, "our race," &c.

pretation, but this particular phrase can only signify, "*ad mare*" or "*versus mare*."

Páradaraya is a conjectural restoration, the arguments in favour of which have been already explained in my notes to the third paragraph at Nakhsh-i-Rustam. That the last element of the compound is *daraya*, "the sea," will admit of no question, for the Median equivalent is the same term which answers to *darayahyá* in the geographical list at Behistun; and as the Scythians of Imáus and of the Tigris in the detailed catalogue of the Satrapies on the grave of Darius, are separately enumerated, there would seem to be no reasonable explanation for the *Saká tyiya* - - *radaraya* in the same list, but to suppose an allusion to the Scythians of the North, whom Darius subdued in his famous expedition beyond the Hellespont¹. *Páradaraya*, moreover, may, I believe, be regularly formed, as an indeclinable compound of the *सच्ययीभाव* class, the first element being the neuter *पारं*, used as a particle or preposition. In Sanskrit, however, the corresponding word *पारेसमुद्रं* is inflected in both its elements.

𐎧 𐎠 𐎢𐎡 DARSH, a root signifying primitively "to dare," and identical with the Sanskrit *दृश्*, the Zend *𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎡* *darah*, and the Greek *θάρσ-ω*². The following derivations occur in the Inscriptions:—

ADARSH(A)NAUSH, [Col. I., l. 53, p. 204,] *Ausus est*.

DARSHAM(A), [Col. I., l. 50, p. 204, Col. IV., l. 37, p. 245, Ins. No. 7, l. 15, p. 312,] *Cohibitionem* (?)

DÁDARSHISH, [Col. II., l. 29, p. 218, &c., &c.,] *Dadarses*.

DÁDARSHIM, [Col. II., l. 33, p. 218, &c., &c.,] *Dadarsem*.

Adarsh(a)naush is the 3rd pers. sing. of the act. imperfect of the fifth class; and, as far as grammatical powers are concerned,

¹ In the notes to the Nakhsh-i-Rustam Inscriptions, I have supposed the Scythians beyond the sea to include the seven last names of the Geographical list; but I have now abandoned that idea, and restrict the *Saká tyiya páradaraya* to the Thracians and the barbarians of the Danube, the Dneister, and the Don. There is a very curious notice also, as I think, of these same European Scythians, in the independent Babylonian Inscription of Persepolis, marked L in Niebuhr's Plates, which I shall endeavour to explain under the head *Saka*.

² Burnouf has already compared the Zend *𐎧𐎠𐎢𐎡* *darshí*, with the Greek *θάρσος* or *θπαρός*. Yaçna, p. 44.

may be compared in every respect with the term *akunaush*, which has been already sufficiently explained. Its Sanskrit correspondent is अकुणोत्¹, which, according to the conjecture formerly offered, may have been originally अकुणोः². The substitution of *darsh* for *dhṛish* in this term must not be referred to the employment of a *guna*; for the radical vowel in verbs of the fifth class, both in Sanskrit and in old Persian, remains in its primitive state³; it must be considered merely as the orthographical artifice which compensates for the want of the vowel अ in the Cuneiform alphabet; and if the short *a* which I have placed in a parenthesis be also admitted between the root and the conjunctive suffix, it must be regarded as a redundant letter, of which the only office is to break up a tri-literal groupe.

Darshama is a term of considerable difficulty. In the first phrase which I have quoted, *kārashim hachá darshama atarsa*, (Beh. Col. I., ls. 50, 51,) the orthography is doubtful; the second letter, indeed, of the word which I have read *darshama*, appears, on the rock to be 𐎠𐎢, rather than 𐎠𐎣; and it is very possible, therefore, that with the reading of *dabashma* (from 𐎠𐎢𐎠, "to impose upon," with the compound affix which occurs in 𐎠𐎢𐎠𐎣, "horror,") the true signification of the phrase may be "the State feared him from his imposture," that is "owing to his imposture;" but in

¹ This term is quoted by Westergaard in his *Radices*, p. 288, from the *Bhag. Puran.*, 17, 81.

² Bopp, however, says, that "the *s* of this form is without doubt a weakening of the original *t*," (see *Comp. Gr.*, s. 462,) and Lassen and Burnouf are of the same opinion. See Ueber die Keilinschriften, p. 246, *Zeitschrift*, p. 254, and Yaçna, Notes, p. 147, where Burnouf quotes the authority of *Panini*, and also compares *Colebrooke Sans. Gr.*, p. 141.

³ We have *ku*, indeed, instead of *kau*, throughout the special tenses of *kunu*, "to do."

⁴ I have formerly translated, "the state feared from opposing him," that is, "feared to oppose him;" and it is certainly more consonant with Cuneiform usage thus to connect the abl. sign *hachá*, "from," immediately with the neuter verb, "to be afraid," than to render *tars*, as an active verb, "to fear," and to make it govern the accusative pronoun *shim*; but on the other hand, I cannot possibly identify *darshama* as an active participle in the ablative case; the termination, indeed, in *ma*, if it stand for *mas*, will belong to a theme in silent *m*, (*Wilkins*, s. 118,) and such themes require to be verbal roots, or modifications of verbal roots ending in the same letter 𐎠.

this case there will still be a difficulty in explaining the ablative ending in short *a*, unless we suppose *at* in nouns of the first class to have been designedly substituted for *át* in the old Persian, to mark a distinction of the neuter from the masculine gender. In the second phrase, also, *hachá daraugá darsham(a) patipayuvá*, it is almost impossible to distinguish whether *darsham(a)* may be an ablative or an accusative; that is, whether it be an adjective in apposition with *daraugá*, or a noun forming the object to the verb. This indeed entirely depends upon whether *patipayuvá* be used in an active or neuter sense, and supposing the term to be derived from प्रु, with the double prefix प्रति and प्र, it may perhaps etymologically signify "keeping apart from," as well as "applying" or "secreting". As it is unusual however to bring a substantive and adjective into immediate contact (without interposing the relative pronoun²;) as the root *darsh*, moreover, with the adjectival suffix in *ma*, (the preceding short *a* being euphonic,) will form no suitable epithet for *daraug*, "a lie;" and above all, as *daraug* is certainly a masculine noun, and the masculine ablative of an adjective formed with that suffix and agreeing with *darauga* would thus necessarily be *darshamá* (for *darshamát*), I think it preferable to read the term प्र प्र प्र प्र in the passage under discussion, *darsham*; comparing it with प्र the accus. of a masc. noun and rendering the entire phrase "from the lie practise restraint³."

In the third passage where the same term occurs, it is impossible to extract any sense from the few disjointed fragments which alone are legible, and I observe, moreover, that although the characters composing this particular word are sufficiently dis-

¹ Westergaard (Rad. Ling. Sans., p. 46,) gives "*disjungere*," as the true meaning of प्रु, but it would also, I suppose, equally with the cognate form प्रुन्, signify "to make an effort." It is impossible, however, to determine any thing satisfactory with regard to *patipayuvá*, for there is no such root in Sanskrit as प्रु or प्रु, and although *prati* becomes *pati*, the true correspondent of प्र should be *fra* and not *pa*.

² *Kára Pársa* and *kára Máda* are at the same time examples to the contrary.

³ "Restraint" is given by Wilson as the sixth meaning of प्र. See Dict. p. 441.